

(307)





THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RELIGIOUS IDEA

IN

EX-OBLATORUM . 8. CAROLI. BIBLIOTHECA · BAYSWATER ·

JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY AND MAHOMEDANISM,

CONSIDERED IN

TWELVE LECTURES ON THE HISTORY AND PURPORT OF JUDAISM,

DELIVERED IN MAGDEBURG, 1847,

BY

DR. LUDWIG PHILIPPSOHN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, WITH NOTES,

DI

ANNA MARIA GOLDSMID



LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN AND LONGMANS.

1855

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WERTHEIMER AND CO.,
CIRCUS PLACE, PINSBURY CIRCUS.



TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The enlightened benevolence with which the author of the following lectures advocated measures for the relief, present and future, of the Jews of Jerusalem, has within the last year made his name almost as familiar to their co-religionists of Great Britain, as it has long been rendered by his able editorship of the 'Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums', to the Israelites of Germany.

Two years since, a German acquaintance called my attention to the work, and kindly sent it to me for perusal. From that perusal I rose, with a strong desire that its contents should be placed within reach of all the educated minds of the community to which I belong. The writer, it appeared to me, supplied a long-existing void and very urgent want, in the Jewish polemical literature of the age. Though not wholly concurring with him on some few points, his general deductions were, I thought and felt, as sound and true, as the elaboration of the arguments that led to them was patient and logical. So the wish deepened into a sense

iv

of a duty to be accomplished,—the duty of placing an English version before all my co-religionists, for whom their non-acquaintance with German renders the original a sealed book. To you then, my dear brothers and sisters in faith and of race, members of all synagogues, natives of all lands spread over the wide surface of our globe, in which the English is the language first lisped by infant lips, I dedicate these pages. Accept them as a labour of good-will and love. To you all, -whether you be of those who by honest reverence for ancient forms, are induced to cling to the exegesis of the Talmud; or whether of such, as a reverence equally honest, leads back to the yet more ancient phase of our common faith, the one presented in the Torah of our inspired legislator, Moses; or whether, perchance, of those finally, who while unendowed with strength of intellect sufficient to enable them to resist the pressure of the time present, that forces them into the path of rationalism, are yet strong enough of heart, to cling to the ties of race, blood and affection; -to all, I believe, a patient examination of the views presented to us by Dr. Philippsohn 'On the Development of the Religious Idea' will not be unfruitful in good. To this inquiry I would also invite my countrymen of other creeds, in the confident hope, that by it they would attain to a truer knowledge of the broad and firm basis on which the religion of the Jews rests, and would learn from it, more clearly to comprehend, more duly to respect, the solemn convictions which lie at the root of the Hebrew's enduring fidelity to his God-revealed faith.

It will teach us all, as many as we are, Talmudists, Mosaists, Rationalists, Christians, better to understand ourselves and others—better to know and to appreciate, all which we severally and respectively reject, all to which we adhere, more wisely to direct the spiritual tendencies of those, who by circumstances of age or position, are committed to our guidance. Yet more! It will teach us a deeper reverence for that Eternal Wisdom, which out of present evil prepareth future good. The present evil we shall outlive, -we are outliving. May the asperities to which I allude, as having so long marked the relation of Christian to Jew, and as having arisen frequently within our own communities, when practical outward reforms were attempted, be likened with justice to the passing of the harrow over the ground! May they have prepared the mental soil of that community and of all mankind, for the seeds of truth,-the grain which the Almighty has garnered up in unmeasured abundance, and which it is the mission, first of the Jews, then of all the human race, gradually, during countless coming ages, to scatter

over the earth. May all men, while sowing in weariness and conflict of body and spirit, reap in gentleness and peace, a rich and holy harvest of love, happiness, and truth, 'Here,' and of bliss eternal, 'Hereafter!'

A. M. G.

St. John's Lodge, Regent's Park.

February 1855.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

The following Lectures were delivered here last winter, in the presence of an audience composed of persons of all religious denominations. I had the satisfaction to find their numbers not only sustained but increased as the course proceeded, in a town whose inhabitants have long made freedom of belief, thought, and speech, an object of their especial and fostering care, and have thus secured to themselves a distinguished name in the annals of civilisation.

Many of my hearers have expressed a wish that these Lectures should appear in print. In preparing to comply with this desire, the question suggested itself to me, whether 1 could advantageously develop much, of which only a slight sketch had been presented, illustrate by notes much, upon which I had but cursorily remarked. But I speedily came to the conviction, that

the work would thereby be too much extended, perhaps well-nigh doubled, and that the aim I had in view might thus be prejudiced. Spoken utterances have a manifest advantage; the speaker can facilitate by the manner, the comprehension of the matter,—he can infuse into his accents the living voice of his heart. He and his words stand in direct relation with the listener. Written utterance fails of this, and has only the compensating capability of operating, with less force it is true, but with more enduring effect on the reader, long after the echo of the spoken word has died away. Each Lecture must necessarily have its own exclusive theme, which it must examine to its close; and thus confined within certain limits, a subject requiring elaborate discussion can extend no further than another demanding briefer consideration. But for these disadvantages, the author finds abundant compensation in the adaptation of the form, and in the pleasure he experiences in placing before an enlightened public, the results of the laborious investigations of years.

In the following Lectures, the path of history has been followed. History, while delineating the future of each, attaches itself to no one party. Whoever, therefore, seeks to reason on strictly historical premises only, without belonging to any one party, will arrive at conclusions that some will deny, others accept as their own. But entire acceptance from any one party, must be the less expect to enjoy.

Without having originated much that is new, I am conscious that I may claim to have struck out a new path. My especial aim and endeavour have been, to remove religion from the ideal station assigned to it, into the position to which it belongs-into life. Religion has so long abandoned society, that it is scarcely a matter of surprise if society has in its turn abandoned religion. The two thus parted must be re-united. Religion must come to understand that it can exercise no true and beneficent influence on the individual, until society collectively shall have become religious. Society must come to comprehend, that it cannot raise itself from its present prostrate condition, until it shall have realised the principles which were long ago enunciated by religion, but of which the removal of religion from the actual world, its taking refuge exclusively in the celestial 'Hereafter,' have caused the loss for actual life.

I shall seek an opportunity of resuming and amplifying my examination of this important branch of my inquiry (only touched upon in Lectures III. and XII.) in a future course, at a fitting moment.

If these printed words share the kindly reception accorded to their spoken utterance, I may feel perfectly tranquil as to the destiny awaiting them.

DR. L. PHILIPPSOHN.

MAGDEBURG, March 15th, 1847.

CONTENTS.

	LEC	TUF	RE I.				PAGE.
INTRODUCTORY					•		1
	LEC	TUR	E II.				
ANTIQUITY AND	Mos	AISM		•		٠	23
	LEC	TUR	E III	Γ.			
ON THE SOCIAL	MOR	ALIT	Y OF	MOS	AISM		51
	LEC	TUR	E IV	r.			
PROPHETISM	•	٠		•		•	79
	LEC	CTUE	RE V				
THE TEACHINGS							105
THE HAGIO					٠	•	100
THE SECOND I			E V		N OF		
TALMUDISM		,					125
	LEC	TUR	E VI	I.			
THE RELATION							
JUDAISM	•	٠	-	٠	٠	٠	145
			E VI				
THE RELATION JUDAISM A							165

LECTURE IX.	
THE JEWS IN THEIR DISPERSIONS .	. 184
LECTURE X.	
THE CONTENTS OF THE TALMUD .	. 203
LECTURE XI.	
THE MOVEMENTS OF RECENT TIMES IN	
ALL RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS	. 222
LECTURE XII.	
THE FUTURE OF RELIGION	. 247

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RELIGIOUS IDEA.

LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTORY.

The Religious or Divine Idea (a term we shall employ in contradistinction to the human Idea, or Heathenism) has its origin in Judaism. Of the truth of this assertion, though involving a fact in many periods designedly ignored or forgotten, not history alone furnishes ample evidence. Christianity and Moslemism alike testify thereto, by their equal recognition of the religious authority of the Judaic biblical writings.

The Religious Idea sprang from Judaism, and has developed itself from Judaism, as from its parent stem. Round that stem its branches yet cling unwithered.

A history of the development of the Religious or Divine Idea, must be therefore necessarily and essentially, a history of Judaism. Again, the latter must resolve itself into the former, if we desire, neither to narrow the history of Judaism into a history of Jewdom,* nor to consider Judaism in respect of its own integral nature

^{*} This term is employed as the nearest approach to the German word 'Judențeit' and analogous to the English Christendom, in signification.—T.

only, but also to comprehend it in its relation to surrounding antagonisms. From the present lectures will be deduced, as I proceed with my course, the confirmation of these propositions. I submit them to you in this place, in order to justify myself in the presumption, that I present virtually an outline of the history of the development of the Religious Idea among mankind generally, while keeping the history of Judaism especially in view, and taking Judaism from its commencement for the guiding thread of my reflections.

What, it may be asked, induces, what emboldens me to treat such a subject in public lectures? I answer, the tendency of the age: I should say rather, the subject itself is a growth of the age. Whatever opinion may be held as to the time in which we live, whether its general characteristics be deemed worthy of praise or condemnation, on one point all will be agreed. In this its true glory consists; the tendency which marks it, is the striving to receive all things spiritual into its own consciousness. In it, the barriers have been thrown down, behind which each domain of thought and belief was wont to entrench itself, within which each withdrew from his neighbour's ken, partly from holding, that to inform himself of the thoughts and convictions of his fellow man was to desecrate his own sanctuary, and partly from arrogance and contempt, conceiving such knowledge to be valueless.

As each believed he owned the highest, the intellectual possessions of another lay at, or rather under, his feet. This period of separation and isolation has passed. All presses onward, and is pressed onward, into the full light of intercommunion and mutual recognition. That which claims continued existence is subjected to

close investigation as to its origin and significance, and the validity of that claim. Arbitrary dismissal is no longer possible; equally impossible is voluntary withdrawal. Retirement into solitude and silence, whether induced by exaggerated self-estimation, or the self-consciousness of weakness, is now wholly infeasible.

In like manner, Judaism, roused from her lethargy by the mighty upheavings of the age, has at length arisen, and steps forth out of her long obscurity, into the broad sunlight of general consciousness. Urged by the agitation around her, she breaks the silence to which she has been, during thousands of years, alike sentenced from without, and self-condemned from within. Favored by the tendency of the time, her voice, so long mute, obtains full hearing. Judaism exists, must, will eternally endure. Judaism must, therefore, make it clearly manifest, both to believers and non-believers, why she now exists, and unto what end she will continue to exist. Judaism claims for herself a permanent, wide, and important place among men-a deep and significant voice in the counsels of men. It behoves her, therefore, to prove her worthiness, her dignity, her indispensability. The whole domain of human thought lies now open to the mental vision, as much of every Jew as of every Christian, of every one in fact, who partakes of the blessing of civilization. No one can longer refuse to contemplate the attainments, spiritual and intellectual of another, to test his own thereby, and to subject them to the full light of investigation, for his own and the general good.

On entering upon our subject, my hearers, the first question that forces itself upon our attention is this: Of what have we to treat, in treating of Judaism? Of

a phenomenon that arose in the very earliest ages, that existed through antiquity, outlived the middle ages, that held on its course during later centuries, and has manifested, in the more recent periods, unexpected vitality, renewed activity, positive and true rejuvenescence.

Assuredly, this sufficiently testifies to the potency of Were it our task to examine a this phenomenon. monument of antiquity-to gather up the venerable remains of an age long by-gone-to linger amid the time-worn relics of a life long buried beneath themhow great, how intense would be the interest they would awaken within us. But this it is not. We here pass into a presence, that coeval with the earliest ages of the race of man, has been his companion on all his wanderings, has followed him, step by step, and prepares anew to follow him on his future course :-- a presence, whose human embodiments may not only be enumerated among the generations of the past, but are now to be found in the midst of all nations, weaving their due portion at the great loom of the web of human destiny; a presence which not alone ruled the spirits of the past, but even at this day fills and forms the mental being of millions.

It stands alone, single of its kind. All historical facts pertain to the periods which they have produced, or by which they have been produced. One only phenomenon has lived through all ages of man's history, until this day; one alone has moved, a living presence, in and through all times. That one is Judaism.

Whence has Judaism derived this capacity? This question has been variously answered. By some it has

been said, "Judaism is a mummy; it resembles the skilfully embalmed corpse of an Egyptian, which remains entire after dissolution." Surely, this comparison can hardly be made in all seriousness; for the lifeless body may lie undisturbed for a time amid the ashes of earthly things; but from the domain of the spirit, all death is excluded, as from a living organization. It is not given to a mummy to combat and be combated; nor to a corpse to act and be reacted upon. Judaism, therefore, must still be regarded as an *Idea*, bequeathed to us by the past.

By others again, the blindness and obstinacy of its followers have been assigned as the cause of the continued existence of Judaism. We are truly justified in the assumption, that the blindness and obstinacy dwell with those who thus dispose of the question. It were possible that one or two generations of men, having the bitter memory of inflicted wrong yet fresh within them, might be swayed by such feelings; but that men should be thus acted upon and enslaved, generation after generation, amid the mutations of ages, and under circumstances the most varied and adverse, by low, narrow, and selfish passions, is wholly inconceivable. No! Entire conviction, unbounded resignation, and a love that knows nought beside, could alone have had power to produce such a result.

If these premises be admitted, then the natural and evident deduction is this:—The *inward* stream of life it is, flowing continuously, though often silently and imperceptibly, through the veins of Judaism, which has nourished the root, invigorated the stem, and imparted the verdant hue of life to the leafy crown, of the primeval palm-tree. Well may it be, that from a

growth that has outlived ages, a decayed bough may sometimes fall—a withered leaf float gently earthwards. But within, in the giant tree's core, the creative sap of life mounts in full tide heavenwards, keeping it healthful and verdant, and powerful to resist, alike the mouldering effect of time, the blasting of the storm, and the stroke of the lightning.

Again then we ask, what is Judaism? The reply that we can here give by anticipation, at the very outset of our proposed enquiry, is in truth comprised in what we have just advanced.

Had Judaism been from its commencement an inherent isolated fact, had it been delivered to us, with a limitation of its activity within its original narrow domain, as its distinctive element—it would have been necessary, ere we entered upon our proposed investigation, that I should have laid before you, my hearers, a clear definition of Judaism. In it, on the contrary, we have recognized a living presence that has existed through all the great periods of the history of man-a presence which, though in its inmost being a unity, has passed through many different phases, and assumed very varying forms. The history of all these forms and phases, and not that of any one of them only, constitutes therefore, the history of Judaism. In and from their collected history alone, is the real omnipresent essential unity of Judaism clearly demonstrable. The solitary ark of the covenant in the wilderness, is not the golden temple of Jerusalem, nor is this the obscure synagogue in the ghetto of the middle ages. The rigidly simple law of Moses in the wilds of Arabia, is not identical with the glowing denunciations of the prophets against the idolatrous and degenerate race of Israel. Different again are the hair-splitting, sophistical acumen of the Talmudist, and the all-weighing generalizing judgment of the philosophical thinker. Judaism then consists, not of any one of these items alone, but of all of them collectively. And though we are well aware that of all these phases, the subject, end, and aim are the same, their purport the same, yet have we no right to pronounce determinately on the latter, until we shall have more closely examined the former.

Although certain marked features are at once clearly perceptible, any anticipation on this subject would be an assumption of that, in respect of which an appeal to history can alone produce conviction.

We must next enquire, what is the true sphere of action of Judaism? The answer would be easy, if it were true—that of religion. From early times, a distinction, it is well known, has been made between man in his religious, and man in his social character. In his relation to that higher Power, whose creature he is, to the Divinity, he is the religious man; in his relation to society, the social man. In the latter, there is again a distinction between the individual man, in his relation to his individual fellow man, and man in his relation as a responsible moral being, a member of society and of the state, to society in general and to the state. As however general morality rests wholly on the relation of man to his God, general morality has come to be considered (as it virtually is) an integral part of religion; so that the moral and religious elements, though they may sometimes be placed in contrast, must co-exist in the human being.

Notwithstanding its antiquity, its historical development, and its present general acceptance, this distinction between the religious and the moral man, i. e., between man in his relation to the Divinity, and man in his relation to society, is after all, my hearers, a purely factitious distinction. It is neither natural, since every man, inasmuch as he exists, is a unity in which mind and spirit, reason and soul, in all their operations, have one concurrent mode of action; -nor is it an original distinction, since history teaches us that in all countries religion and state were originally one. Judaism having been a primary, and not, as are other and more recent religions, a secondary creation (by secondary, I understand such as have arisen subsequently to the governmental formation of the states in which they respectively prevail), Judaism necessarily considers the social as well as the religious man-man in fact, as an individual whole. The separating the religious from the social being, could not by possibility originally obtain in Judaism, but was necessarily received into it, when outward circumstances compelled its admission: that is, when Judaism ceased to possess its own state, and to rule over its own society.

Judaism must therefore include, among its hopes and aspirations for the future, and its future achievements, be that future ever so remote, the rendering universal the recognition of the great principle—the unity of the social and the religious man—a principle which ought to be now considered, as in fact it is, an article, an inherent part of the 'Israelite's confession of faith.' As we are considering, not the Judaism of any one period, but that of all periods, we must direct our attention as well to its action as a religion, as to its social influence.

I state my proposition simply thus:—'Judaism considers man to be, in all his relations, a unity.'

Hence results another peculiarity. Judaism must contain certain elements wholly opposed to all else that time has produced and destroyed. Had Judaism been of like nature with all things that successive centuries have engendered, transmuted, and annihilated, it must have passed through the same vicissitudes and have undergone the same mutations as they have, and have at length passed away as they have passed away. Judaism would now, in that case, be merely remembered as a form of thought that had achieved its appointed work, had been worn out and cast wholly aside. Yet more: Judaism must still in the present, contain those indwelling contrasts to all that is around, or it would long ere this have been absorbed by, or amalgamated with, all its surroundings. In fine, it must stand security for its own continuance, so long as its tenor and purport have not found general acceptance; I should say rather, so long as all men shall not have been so thoroughly imbued with its tenor and purport, as to render these a part of their mental being. We learn from these deductions, that the contrast of which we treat has ever existed, as it still exists, not in the form alone, but in the essence. A contrast in form disappears with the thing of which it is the form, while the same contrast in the essence may obtain so long as the thing continues, even though each form under which it successively appears, be completely different from the one it previously assumed.

I have been compelled, my hearers, to press these observations thus early on your attention, because they determine the course to be followed in these lectures which range themselves under three heads:—

First. The close examination of each single phase of

Judaism, in order that Judaism may be fully comprehended as a unity—a living historical presence.

Secondly. Judaism presenting this contrast, the external things and circumstances among which it was born, has lived, and those in the midst of which it now exists must be considered; and,

Thirdly. It must be shown that Judaism was not and is not, the mere idea or theory alone; but that to the Jewish race, as its certain appointed depositary, was committed its realization, material and spiritual—to Jewdom.

Of necessity therefore, Judaism itself has been much and variously influenced by these, its recipients or bearers, and by the changes of destiny and circumstance which they have sustained. And again, the destinies of Jewdom must in their turn, have received from the general design of Judaism, their direction, tendencies, and mutations. There have been consequently, a powerful and continuous action and re-action between Jewdom and Judaism; and the tendencies and character assumed by each, must have been alternately determined by the other. Let us not deem that this was prejudicial to Judaism, that the idea has suffered under the action of matter, and would have attained to a fuller and purer development, if it had not been subjected to this material action from without. In looking around us in nature, we perceive that throughout the creation of God, there prevails this connection between mind and matter-between the inward essence and the outward form. Out of that connection only, are perfectly organized beings evolved. Did the idea exist independently of matter, it would never reach many stages of development to which it is impelled by matter and its transformations. Thorough acquaintance with the destines

of Jewdom, is therefore wholly indispensable to the full comprehension of Judaism.

In taking a general view of the life of Judaism, we at once perceive that four great epochs have therein arisen—Mosaism, Prophetism, Talmudism, and lastly, the Judaism of recent times. Permit me briefly to sketch these four epochs, of which I can here present but a shadowy outline, reserving to myself the opportunity of filling up, as I proceed, the details of the picture, and of adding distinctness and fixedness to the delineation.

Mosaism sprang up in the very midst of Heathenism; to this it presented a complete and powerful contrast. The first was, of its very nature, a whole, an entire unity: while the second was even then, complicated in its forms, and had developed a low and depraved moral condition in mankind generally, and the political degeneracy which thence universally ensues, in the states where it prevailed. Mosaism is the ground-work of Judaism, on which not only the superstructure was erected, but in which was laid the very key-stone of the arch that has supported all the subsequent stages of its development. The main-spring of Mosaism, giving movement to its whole machinery, is the unity of the social and the religious man-the unity of the doctrine and the life. Mosaism recognizes no difference between the idea and its realization. By it, the latter is understood to be, the passing into tangible being of the former—the incorporation of the idea. As in all organized beings, the conception and the creation are one, so that they are that, which it was designed they should be; so in Mosaism, the doctrine and

the life are to be one and the same—a perfect congruity. In Mosaism consequently, the dogmas are not presented as an isolation, but as the law, as the life. Mosaism therefore controls the whole life of man, and considers it not as a reflection, an image of the doctrine—but as the doctrine itself. Mosaism does not separate soul and body—the spiritual and corporeal existence. On the contrary, Mosaism makes the law of the spiritual, the law of the material life also, and comprehends man herein likewise as a unity.

So soon as Mosaism was promulgated, the conflict between the idea and its material reality began; this reality, being, the people to whom it was delivered. The question was, how far that people could achieve the fulfilment of Mosaism.

After brief periods of prosperity, the Jewish nation declined and fell, as all peoples decline and fall. At one time they abandoned Mosaism, and plunged into that most opposed to the teachings of Moses-Heathenism; at another, the form, the worship, the sacrifices. were retained, and Mosaism was thus transformed into an empty soulless ceremonial. Prophetism then arose. Its aim was to bring back to Mosaism the Jewish race, that had for the most part lapsed into idolatry. But Prophetism was powerless to save the life, and its efforts were directed to the preservation of the idea. Thence Prophetism itself was at once led to sever the idea from the life-the doctrine from the law; while in true pure Mosaism, they formed, I repeat, the strictest unity. Prophetism treats of the doctrine, and is silent upon the law. Prophetism therefore, is a development of Mosaism, but of only one portion thereof, viz., of the doctrine of a God and of general morality.

Talmudism, the third phase of Judaism, took a directly opposite course.

Of the people who had passed into captivity, in Assyria and Babylon, some only returned; these being, in respect of their faithful adherence to the teachings of Moses, the choicest portion of the population. Sorrow and adversity had deepened their fidelity; but the genius of the national life had vanished. It was a second phase of that existence, from which the vigour of adolescence was gone. The spirit, if not the will, was feeble. Of this, the writings of that period, and the long silence of many subsequent centuries, furnish equal and abundant proof;—centuries, of which the annals of the Hebrew race contain no record. Well nigh four centuries of lethargy terminated at last by the waking up of the people to new life, at the trumpet-call of the Maccabees.

Then again the severance of the *life* from the *idea* became the sign of the time; but the idea was now thrust aside, and all the vigour and energy left, manifested themselves in the regulation of material life.

Thus Talmudism had regard to that portion only of Mosaism, which Prophetism disregarded. The law was enlarged upon and held to be the absolute rule of life, but not to be the fulfilment of the *idea*. So the carrying out of the true Mosaic thought was often surreptitiously evaded. For example, the ordinance for the remission of all debts at the end of every seventh year was abrogated; while it was determined by rigorous enactments, what fruits were to be used in these, the years of release.

Meantime, the second great epoch in Jewdom drew to its close. The dispersion of the people took

place: but they carried every where with them, the mental direction then recently imparted to them. Out of these elements was Talmudism evolved. It had three component parts:—1st. The unconditional authority of the law of Moses: 2nd. The national habits and manners traditionally conveyed and developed; 3rd. The impediments arising to the complete observance of Jewish life, from the removal of the people from Palestine. By the exercise of singular power of intellect, of a capacity perhaps unique of its kind, Talmudism combined these three elements Talmudism comprehends accordingly:—lst. The elaboration of the Mosaic code, in respect of its material form, pursued to its most extreme results, and most casuistical deductions: 2nd. The embodiment with the very text of the Mosaic code (which text it subsequently obscured), of much extraneous matter that had originated with the people themselves, and in the manners and customs of daily life; 3rd. The removal of the obstacles created by the exodus of the people from Palestine, by the substitution of things analogous to the Mosaic code. Talmudism goes far beyond the aim and scope of the Talmud itself, because it partially received the final development of Rabbinism.

These then are the three grand and distinct epochs of Judaism. Nevertheless, the life of Judaism was not wholly restricted to the exact forms it received from them; for to Prophetism, to which they bear a close affinity, being probably a growth of the same age, immediately succeeded the so called hagiographical writings. In like manner, the Midrash and Cabala were offshoots of Talmudism, as was the Aristotelian-Arabian-Judaic philosophy, of Rabbinism. To these three great

divisions may now be superadded a fourth - the Judaism of modern times. You will at once presume. that being thus designated, it has no specific appellation. You will with equal justice conclude, that it is devoid of any marked characteristics. Assuredly this is far from being a cause for regret, or a ground of reproach to modern Judaism. In truth, the something that we have now to analyse, is but in progress of formation—of self-development—of self-regeneration. It would be unwise in us to predetermine what will issue out of this period of transition, through which we are now passing. One thing only is clearly shown. From the present struggle, Judaism must come forth renewed, invigorated, with veins transfused with health and hope. For on the one hand, we see that Rabbinism has become wholly inoperative, if indeed it is not virtually defunct; while, on the other, we perceive that throughout its domain, Judaism is every where quickening into active life. We see besides, that numerous bodies of Jews, with the full consciousness of being, and the fixed purpose of continuing to be, Jews, have yet placed themselves without the pale of Talmudic law. We see moreover, that those Jews who still rigorously enforce the authority of the Talmud and of the Rabbins, recognize non-Talmudists to be Jews, so that intermarriage and a common worship now obtain-a fact in itself sufficient to indicate the approach, if not the presence, of a new combination. But irrespective of this tangible proof, the causes actually in operation must inevitably produce a new phase of Judaism,

In the middle of the last century, the Jews began to

quit the intellectual solitude in which, with but small exception, they had dwelt for five hundred years, and to participate in the general mental culture and growing intelligence of the age. Towards the end of the last century, the portals of social life were half opened to the Jews; and in some states, entire, in others, partial, civil equality was legally accorded them. In both positions (the brief space of time that has elapsed being duly remembered), the Jews have advanced with giant strides. They have pressed on over as much ground in fifty years, as other races have employed five hundred to traverse. All these circumstances must necessarily operate to produce the solution of the Talmudic-rabbinical question, as it affected and affects the then and the present religious condition of the Jews.

Citizenship, its rights and obligations, wholly altered the character of their daily life, calling, and labour. Consequently, the forms of religious life came into constant collision with the duties of the citizen and the artizan. A freer and more extended intellectual development undermined the belief in, and reverence for, human authorities, and suggested inquiry into the validity and object of that, which had till then found full and unconditional acceptance.

It cannot indeed be otherwise, but that these new and hitherto unknown conditions of being, should foreshadow the approach of a like new, and hitherto unknown phase of Judaism. For the Jews existed first as a nation, then among other nations; while now they live with, and have entered into the municipal, civil, and political life of these other nations. The Jewish race has never passed through any historical period resembling the

present age.* The mutations of form which await Judaism, can at this time be matter of speculation alone. Purposing to resume, on some future occasion, the consideration of this point, I shall here detain you only while I present a few remarks on the course which it has hitherto pursued. These remarks I would preface by briefly asserting, that the Judaism of modern times has followed, inversely, the same path previously taken by Judaism in general. It began with Talmudism, accepting it as the standard by which life was to be measured, though simultaneously recognizing the necessity of a future development of the idea. Such was the theory of Mendelssohn. He maintained that full and free self-consciousness was a part of Judaismthat it was not a religion dependent on belief, but that it addressed itself especially to the understanding. Yet he held the traditional, or oral law, to be the guide and rule of daily life. So great an inconsistency could not long prevail; for a theory always tends to produce its own realization, and admits of no permanent discrepancy with itself in practice. To represent the idea as free, and the life as fettered, was wholly arbitrary. Rabbinism was speedily superseded by the imperfect and partial adoption of Prophetism. Strict adherence was professed to the doctrine of a God, and to the precepts of general morality, while all that Prophetism presented, which could be considered as applicable to the particular period of its promulgation, and as referable to its then relation to the children of Israel, was solicitously discarded. The whole of Judaism was thus reduced to a few general principles of manners and morals.

^{*} A brief period in the Roman empire, and contemporaneous with that of its decline, excepted.

This doubtless was a complete system of self-delusion, since the retention of all that was positive in principle was enforced, yet was not one item carried into practice. Even the very idea which forms the basis on which prophecy wholly rests,-that of revelation, was allowed to sink into twilight.* Again it became clearly manifest, that a complete contradiction had been introduced into Judaism. The conception offered thus a direct contrast to its practical fulfilment. The first was a theory, not reducible to practice; the second was a system, devoid of all logical theory. The introduction of some reforms was, it is true, attempted; and the first material into which they were so introduced, as it offered a neutral and public ground, was divine service. Much that was beneficial was thereby effected; for it is impossible that by the development of religious feeling, piety and devotion should not be awakened and fostered in the individual. To their promotion, schools and synagogues offer, doubtless, powerful aids. Yet all this failed to reconcile actual and accepted systematic discrepancies. So another step has been recently taken, in the direction of return to Mosaism. It has at length come to be fully understood and acknowledged, that on this foundation alone, where the Idea and the life meet and are one, are the re-edification and regeneration of Judaism possible. Let us be well understood. To return to the full and entire letter of Mosaism is a manifest impossibility, because its necessary conditions

^{*} It may here be observed, that the Jews in England have not, as a body, passed through this phase of Judaism, of which Germany has been, and is, the special theatre.—T.

no longer obtain. Three thousand years, with their mutations, lie between us and the circumstances of its then existence.

By these changes, the fulfilment of three-fourths of the law of Moses,* which were subsequently superseded even by the Talmud (such as the laws of sacrifice, those regulating the physical and sanitary condition of the people, of the agricultural and statistical distribution of the soil), was rendered materially impossible. But I repeat, in Mosaism alone are contained the real significance, the vital principle of Judaism. Our present task is therefore-"To work out within us into clear consciousness, fixed and definite ideas of Mosaism, and to determine how far it is possible, under the conditions of our present existence, to give those ideas life and form, and to make them actual and active in us and among us." Thus far, my hearers, we have considered Judaism as an isolated existence, having its own sphere of development on earth. But amid mankind nothing can dwell wholly apart, nothing in the circle of humanity can live for itself alone. It would be as though each member of our physical frame, head, arm, and eve, sought independent action. All mankind is, in truth, but one organism, undivided and entire. In whatsoever truth dwells, in whatsoever truth is, thence must truth come forth amongst men, and make its value current in the world of men. From the nature of Judaism itself we have already deduced, that it presents a distinct contrast to all that is around it

^{*} For whose suspension the divinely inspired legislator himself provided, by the stringent and reiterated limitation of their fulfilment to the Temple of Jerusalem and the soil of Judea Deut, xii. 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 26. Ibid xvi. 6. Ibid xxvi. 2.—T.

-and that this antagonism must of necessity act on the surrounding world and have a tendency, whether successful or not, to overspread the earth and to win it to itself. And this has ever been the genius of Judaism. That it was the religion of the future, was the leading thought of Prophetism, to whose realization all history amply testifies. It is universally admitted that in Judaism Christianity had its origin; and both these form the combined source in which Mahomedanism takes its rise. The idea, or rather ideal significance of Judaism, sought in the first stage to break ground and wear for itself a channel throughout the world of men. But thence a two-fold conclusion may be drawn. First; -- Judaism had then capacity to retain for and within itself, but not to disseminate, such of its component parts as were necessary for its individual continuance. And secondly; -mankind could receive from Judaism so much only as was suited to their then requirements, and must develop for and within themselves, and independently of Judaism, that which they so received. Judaism kept therefore all that specifically appertained to itself, as also a large portion of its moral import, which it was not able then, but which it is destined in coming years, to share with all humanity. The influence exercised by Judaism in the world was not then suspended; nor has it ceased even now, for the cessation of that influence and the extinction of Judaism would be coeval.

To Judaism, therefore, was confided a double charge: to reserve a portion of its indwelling truth for the future of the human race; to deliver over another portion of that truth to the then existing world. Both tasks involve a double conflict: one with the world, as a

destroying, the other as a resisting power. And this forms, in fact, the real character of the history of Judaism, and especially of that of Jewdom,-of the Jewish race. The "conflict of the idea with the reality." This people had first to fight out this battle within itself, and afterwards with the whole world. The Hebrews were called upon, as recipients and bearers of Judaism, first to combat with themselves as a means of preparation for entire self-devotion to their appointed task; then with all peoples by whom this their mission is not acknowledged, and by whom, in consequence of the general contrast to themselves therein presented, their claim thereto must necessarily be rejected. But this struggle, notwithstanding the hard destiny it prepared for them, proved to be the very means by which the perpetuation of the Jewish race was to be effected. Viewed in this light, the history of Jewdom assumes an aspect totally different, from that which it has hitherto borne. The objects which have usually first presented themselves to the mental vision of its adherents, have been, the blood that has flowed, the stripes that have been received, the wounds inflicted, the funeral pyres that have been heaped and kindled, during the long long struggle. Its opponents, on the other hand, have had regard to nought, save the defects and infirmities engendered in Jewdom by a world's oppression. A totally altered mien has this picture now assumed. It may be truly said to furnish the subject, most honourable, most glorious in the annals of mankind. Jewdom has fought the battle of the divine idea with the material. In this she has suffered, in this she has conquered. Every drop of blood is a victory, every funeral pyre, a torch of triumph. A race of men, the

smallest of the peoples of the earth, have stood arrayed against a world, with 'the idea,' for 'the idea,' on behalf of 'the idea,' and failed not. Surely this is the thought most elevating, most glorious, most sublime in the world of man!

And from this point, we now proceed to contemplate the history of Jewdom. Having thus unbarred the portal, we pass over the threshold into the interior of the edifice.

LECTURE II.

ANTIQUITY AND MOSAISM.

THE records of history and the statements of travellers bearing concurrent testimony to the fact, that by all the peoples of the earth, even by those lowest in the scale of humanity, a deity is acknowledged, many and various are the hypotheses which have been advanced, in order to account for this great phenomenon. What course ought we to take that we may arrive at a truthful conclusion respecting it? It will be necessary, in the first place, to keep out of view all developed conditions of the human mind, or the conception of a divinity would appear to be reached by a developed intelligence only. We must in like manner, pass over all ingenious conjectures not admitting of direct proof, such as the pre-supposition of an original people, a primeval revelation, a mystic age, etc., -otherwise we shall have assumed, but we shall not have explained. Let us then trace the human mind back, to its simplest and most uncivilized state, and there find the necessity for the conception of a deity. In this way alone can the universality of the idea be explained.

Personal identity—the feeling of himself—is natural to man. He is conscious of differing from all things else: he feels his individuality, i. e., that he is distinct

from the things external to him. So strong is this innate perception, that man in a state of nature experiences childish wonder when first he learns, that in his physical organization he resembles a vast series of other beings. Having the instinctive feeling of his separateness from every thing external to himself, his existence suffices to satisfy him that he exists.

Man is self-conscious; he pre-eminently is. Other things surrounding him, however, act upon him: he is sensible of their salutary or injurious influences; they satisfy or they oppose, either his necessities or desires; and their tendencies may even be inimical to his existence. Thus he recognises in them properties favorable or adverse to himself, which he must respectively win and repel, or against which he must defend himself. He observes further, that in the contest between these influences and himself, he is generally insufficient to win their favor, or to divert their hostility. Lastly, he perceives their mutability; he is to-day benefited by that which injured him yesterday, and vice versa; whence again, his own impotence in comparison with the might dwelling in other things, forcibly impresses him. Thus is he compelled to acknowledge a power in external things, which is in opposition to him, because he feels it has the ascendancy over him-it towers above the reach of his perceptions. This power in things external to himself is to him Deity; the absolute acknowledgment of the former, is the conception of the latter, as it necessarily must have arisen in every people.

This method of elucidation is to be preferred for two reasons: first, because it rejects all conjectures of mystical and psychological ingenuity, presupposes nothing in the rude child of nature but that which is necessarily inherent in his mental constitution; and also because in fact the development of the idea of a divinity commences historically from this point.

And at this point, all antiquity remained, and a great part of mankind still remains, (of course with certain modifications) viz., the seeking the conception of the Deity, in things external to man and in their governing forces.

The lowest stage* of this conception is Fetishism, or Shamanism. The crude perception of the Fetish worshipper recognizes in external things the hostile only, that which puts obstacles to his existence, or to the gratification of his wants. Here, all is exclusively personal; the man still refers, child-like, every thing to himself: whatever is agreeable and useful he tacitly accepts as a matter of course, but what is antagonistic and hostile excites his attention. He seeks to propitiate the adversary by sacrifices, and thus to interest him in his well-being; or, he tries to overcome him by means of exorcisms, contortions, dances, etc. In order to provide himself with a visible sign of this hostile power, the Shaman selects the first obstacle he encounters,—a stone, a block of wood, or the like. So soon however as an insuperable difficulty again arises, he acknowledges the first symbol to be ineffectual, deposes it, and selects another. Throughout Central Africa and in Upper Asia, this is the grade of intelligence that exists at the present day amongst an enormous, an untold population.

But so soon as man has begun to observe nature external to himself, so soon as his mind has learned to

^{*} The Religious-Philosophy of the Jews. By Dr. S. Hirsch. Leipsic, 1842.

look beyond the present, and to embrace a longer period of time, he becomes cognizant, not only of a destructive, but also of a beneficent influence. He beholds division in this outward nature-life and death, growth and decay-antagonisms, therefore, in perpetual conflict. Thence it follows, that the world and life are no longer to him an unknown entity, but a mystery of which he seeks the solution. This is the second stage at which the peoples of Asia, as also Egypt, have remained. And where was the explanation sought of the mystery of these two warring powers? First, in the external forms of nature. Men saw that beneficent and hostile influences alternately prevail, that the operations of nature begin, cease, and return, according to fixed laws; and that consequently, self-preservation is possible through this order alone, since according to these laws, at fixed periods, these hostile influences are invariably suspended. Thus order or measure appears as the controller of the destructive powers, bringing them into balance with the beneficent influences,therefore, as divine. This is the religion of Fohi, professed by the Chinese and Japanese. They acknowledge a trinomial godhead-Sanzai; the first, Zai is the firmament and stars, the fructifier: the second, the earth. with fire, air, water, the fructified; the third is humanity, which subsists by reason of the order in these two, and has its personification in the Emperor, as the head of this order. Every thing must contribute to the preservation of order and of a due balance of power; man, therefore, forms the third of these co-operating powers.

But as this order illustrates only the outward form or expression of nature, but not the inner essence, the more developed mind must conceive the beneficent and

hostile influences to be separate antagonistic powers, which are of necessity adjusted by a third and higher agency. This view accordingly followed, at first in a concrete form. Light was believed by the Persians to be the concrete essence of life, increase, and good; darkness, that of death, annihilation, and evil: two equi-potent, ever-warring powers, Ormuzt and Ahriman. As in consequence of their equality there could be no other result from their conflict than their reciprocal destruction, a third power was sought, superior to them-Zeruane-Akrene, or unknown destiny, who, with inconceivable absoluteness, keeps both at war and suffers neither to achieve the victory. It is the duty of man to promote the kingdom of Ormuzt, by the reproduction of life, planting, sowing, etc., and also by external purity; as after the lapse of a certain period of time, the light will yet conquer.

Among intellectual nations, this concrete view would naturally give place to an abstract one. The Indians conceived this world of mutability, of alternating birth and death, that in itself bears no solution of its purpose, to be a subordinate state—a Here, beyond which there is a Hereafter, the real positive world, to which the world visible is but the evil antithesis. Above mutable existence,* they place existence absolute.† This they imagine as an infinite unoccupied space—an indefinite yonder—Brahm. Man can attain to this state of blessedness, on the condition of a complete renunciation of the life natural. To effect this, he must mortify and extinguish his natural appetites, and reduce his wants to the utmost; he must dwell alone and motionless in profound obliviousness of all other matter of

^{*} Das Geienbe.

thought, lost in the contemplation of the sacred word, Aoum. But how did the visible Here, come out of this immaterial Infinite? The Hereafter, the Indian knows not. He says, merely, that in Brahm there arose a thought to create a world in contrast to itself, and this thought evolved itself into three ruling powers: Brahma, the creator; Siva, the destroyer; Vishnu, symbolized by water the preserver.

The means by which the material universe could evolve itself out of a nonentity remains, notwithstanding the above theorem, a riddle unsolved. Amongst the Egyptians, the inscrutability of this question was a chief article of faith. This inscrutable original being, they called Neitha: she is that which was, is, and is to come; but to no mortal has it been granted to raise her mystic veil. Neitha, therefore, is the inscrutable primal essence, from whom, they averred, successive trinities emanated; and from the last of these, viz., Osiris, Isis, and Horus, the visible world received being. This Neitha, or primal essence, has impressed her image on the emanated world, upon every speciality thereof, but more particularly on the animal kingdom. The animals represent individual features of the Deity; therefore they, such as cats, crocodiles, ibexes, etc., are worthy of human worship.

To all the above-named religions, which conceive antagonism in nature under the form of a dual godhead, resolving itself into a third and higher power, Sabeanism offered a marked difference. It prevailed throughout Asia Minor, from Assyria to Phænicia and Arabia. According to its system, existence rested, not in the above-mentioned antagonisms, but in the union and amalgamation of the naturally antagonistic elements.

Heat and cold, drought and moisture, separately, would be destructive; their combination only produces life. All is therefore necessary; and the necessity of nature is the highest, the dominant principle in the universe. This necessity of nature is shown forth most manifestly in the stars, especially in the seven planets known to antiquity—the Sun, Moon, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, and Saturn—which are severally inhabited by the dominant forces of nature. It is the duty of man to resign himself entirely to this necessity. The highest expression of that resignation is offering human sacrifices to Moloch, the Sun, the greatest of the gods.

Though all these religions emanated, as we have seen, from one profound thought, sublimating the mysteries of being into the certainty of divine agency, yet in attempting to unravel nature in her separate forms, they lowered that first thought, and gave fancy free play. Man in the infancy of civilization, does not distinguish between things animate and inanimate, but ascribes life to every natural object. His wonder is especially excited by such as are lifeless in themselves, yet present the appearance of activity. To these he is ever prone to attribute an extraordinary, supernatural, or even divine power. Therefore the primary difficulty was, how man, under the action of these conflicting influences on himself, should first arrive at the idea of a divinity, to whom the thought of creation should be ascribed. This accomplished, he could give free scope to his imagination, in making to himself, in conformity with his observations, gods and spirits out of natural and human objects. Thus in every misfortune the Shaman sees the interference of evil spirits. The Chinese sets Genii, whose duty is the preservation of order, over every individual, over every province and state, over every mountain and river. He worships these Genii, in the most hideously shaped idols; but deposes them when any thing disturbs this law of general order, i. e., when any mischance occurs to himself. The Indian theory teaches, that out of three supreme powers, there emanated eight subordinate divinities, among whom are Suria, the sun, and Indra, the ruler of the air. Under the dominion of Indra there are thirty-three good spirits, who are opposed by Jacksha and Rackshasa, the spirits of evil. But every thing in nature is finally an emanation from God. The Ganges and the Himalaya are actually God, as the ape and cow are actual prototypes of the Deity. Again, the Persian places under Ormuzt, the pure spirits of life, the Fervers, six Amshaspands, and innumerable Izeds, ever present, ever active, ever honoured agencies, indwelling all things. In the realm of Sabeanism, every tribe, every city, had its own particular star, which it worshipped as its god, its Baal. All these religions have a uniform characteristic. The basis on which their whole system rests, is to ascribe divinity to that which lies especially under the notice of their votaries, in India, to the Ganges; in Egypt, to the Nile; to light, in the bright gorgeous land of Persia; in Asia Minor, where heat and drought are often injurious, to combination, etc.

If we turn from the peoples of the East, to those of the West, we observe a distinctly new phase, the *third* grade in our classification. Whereas the former deified nature, on account of her ever-varying action on man, the peoples of the West,—Greeks, Romans, and Germans, deify, within the realm of nature, humanity itself. They identify nature and humanity. The sensations which external influences produce in man, they transfer to nature herself. The effects experienced by the Eastern, are received by him as the natural action of these phenomena; the Greek, on the contrary, attributes to them the will to produce this effect, the will being consequent upon a feeling pertaining to them. The Oriental regarded only the permanent qualities of things; the Greeks, their temporary influences; for example,—the same sea which to-day brings the mariner into the desired haven, may to-morrow dash him lifeless on desert shores: the same sun which this year brings forth nature's richest gifts. may, in the next, scorch up the ground into a barren pestilential waste. A changing will must therefore dwell in the things of nature: and this will must spring from sentiments similar to those in the breast of man: from passions such as love, hatred, revenge, or forgive-From this view, two several consequences are found to result: first, every natural object has a god in itself, and this divinity is swayed by human passions; secondly, every human passion has its own god. There is a god of heaven-Jove-who now loves, now rages. Love itself has a god, nay different gods, according to the various kinds of love. There is a god of peace, and a god of war; and every god lives sometimes in peace, sometimes at war. Hence, not the world, but the gods first came into existence. Fancy then exercised unlimited sway in the realm of natural and psychological discovery. The line of demarcation between the gods and men, must, according to the Grecian system, necessarily and wholly disappear; and thus we find all men around whose brows the halo of antiquity rests, translated to the sphere of the gods. The Roman and northern mythologies have similar tendencies, and only vary in accordance with their respective national idiosyncrasies. The practical and egotistical Roman aimed, by means of his gods and their worship, chiefly at the useful, the German, at personal bravery.

In order to complete the portraiture of the religious spiritual life of the ancients, it is necessary to glance at their philosophy, which is however the especial product of the Grecian mind alone. A modern writer says, 'An unfounded and prejudiced notion it is, to maintain that the philosophers of paganism had truth in their lives, although the religions of paganism were false. To prove the necessity of revelation, recourse is often had to the assertion, that by means of philosophy, individuals and the philosophic schools only arrived at a knowledge of truth, but that through revelation the whole world is brought near to God.' And this statement is in the main true; for the philosophy of the ancients has had no vocation save this; first, to overthrow the religious systems of antiquity, and afterwards its own. Philosophy began as did religion, by trying to discover the cause of all causes, the first principle of creation. Whilst the Ionic school conceived a particular element to be that first principle, the Pythagorean, number and harmony, and the Eleatic school taught that matter had no substantial existence and that truth dwelt in the 'abstract' alone; whilst Heraclitus made destiny, Empedocles again the eternal but ever-changing combination of the elements, to be the principle of creation, they had successively idealised and abnegated Fetishism, and the religions of China, India, Persia and Sabeanism. Anaxagoras was the first to distinguish

between the 'visible' and 'invisible,' matter and spirit, and to declare the spirit to be that which sets matter in motion. The Visible is at first a 'chaos' combined of infinitely minute equal particles, which the Invisible the Novs, intelligence, sets in motion, and from their alternate dispersion and combination, the natural world rose into existence. This idea was evidently also that of the Egyptian religion. Both refer to an inscrutable and therefore vague 'first principle.' This theory was fatal to the religion of Greece, for if intelligence was the supreme principle in the universe, the claim of the Grecian gods to divine powers was nullified, since it and the creations of the unbridled imagination could not co-exist. As this 'intelligence' of Anaxagoras was still indeterminate and vague, the Sophists transformed it into a purely subjective principle. Nothing exists save that which is perceptible by the intellect. In opposition to this idea, Socrates contended that if nothing was, then intelligence or mind was not, man himself was not, and consequently man can know nothing; whereas the Sophists, in holding that that only of which they had knowledge could have being, presumed they knew everything. Socrates, therefore, had recourse to the Life Universal, of which he took the following external view. The world is conformable to a fixed purpose and design, because in it all things harmonize, and the individual is constantly being absorbed by the general. Therefore, in the subordination of the individual to the general, consists virtue. Plato carried this theory further. He recognized the Universal only to be an abstract idea; it reached its ultimatum in the aggregate union of all specialities, unity in multiplicity. The idea,

however, had a pre-existence, and the creation and application of every thing perceptible to the senses was in accordance with the conception. Man brings ideas forth out of himself; he has previously beheld them in a former state of being; and as every idea also presupposes its opposite, the result of the whole is unity in multiplicity. Aristotle takes an exactly opposite course. The Universal he asserts, is not a positive reality, but real only in reference to particular or special things; the general is only a possibility; the design dwelling in every speciality is what must be sought after. Aristotle, therefore, pursues specialities as the only actual existencies, without tracing them back to the Universal, to God who in his system is a possibility and no more. He regards nature as an assemblage of isolated facts. But in this system was involved the disorganization of the philosophy, as well as of the religion, of the Greeks. In the latter the gods appear as so many specific divinities, unaccompanied by the conception of one Omnipotent Being; in the former are contained some isolated truths, but no one generalizing, all pervading, absolute truth. The later schools effectually carried on in the heart of the Roman Empire, the work of self-dismemberment, till all the comfortlessness of the Pagan religion as a philosophy became manifest and universally acknowledged, inducing as its final result, popular and philosophical scepticism.

Such, my hearers, is the completed picture of the whole religious mental life of Antiquity, as also of that part of mankind which at the present day, yet lingers in this stage of development. Imperfect as this sketch may be, it is sufficient to indicate to you

the basis, the purport, and the result of the whole. The basis is egotism; for all these systems sprang only from the relation of external nature to man;—the purport is the contradiction involved in existence and non-existence, entity and non-entity, life and death, production and decay, and in their continuous alternation the union of which it is impossible to conceive,—the result is despair, misery, for the consciousness of man cannot extract the truth, and exhausts itself in the attempt. What is God in man's sight? Either a voluntarily accepted necessity, whose being is inexplicable, or a voluntarily assumed third existence, by whose omnipotent decree the antagonism of two other divinities is upheld; or an unmeaning empty 'Yonder,' whence the transit to this world, the 'Here,' is incomprehensible; or the ingenuous confession of the Inscrutable-it is, but we know not what it is. Creations of the fancy fill up the gaps. How real and how general were the misery and despair reigning in the consciousness of man, in the later periods of the Roman empire, history clearly shows; and of this subject we purpose at a fitting moment to resume the consideration.

With these things Mosaism came into contact. From its earliest growth to its latest stage, it remained in distinct contrast, as a mental system, to antiquity, until that antiquity had entirely exhausted its own vitality, and had proved, even to self-conviction, its inability to discover truth. Certain truths it had indeed been able to bring to the test of human consciousness; yet these were but of secondary value, since they had not been resolvable into one absolute truth.

What then is the essential point of difference between the religions and philosophemes of Antiquity, and Mosaism? The former had proceeded from man, from the apparently antagonistic relation of outward nature to man. In the presence of the mystery, the antagonism of life and death, being and non-being, which he could not solve, man assumed them to be divine. But Mosaism went forth from God. The former said—'The world is, therefore is there a God'; but the latter declared,—'God is, therefore the world exists.'

Starting from this one proposition, all becomes clear to our view. Antiquity saw mankind and the world, and sought as their originator a Deity. Mosaism found God, or rather possesses Him, and proceeding from God, comes to the world and mankind. The Deity of the religious and philosophic systems of antiquity, could not possibly be aught save the personification of their own view of nature: therefore the antagonism visible in its external phenomena, they ascribed to the cause of that phenomena. In Mosaism this antagonism did not exist, for no such principle of division could spring from the Divine Unity. While the mind of Paganism could not advance beyond the idea of production and dissolution, being and nonbeing-to the mental perception of Mosaism, the conception and existence of God presented no difficulty; it realized God Himself, and the resolution of all existence in Him. The human idea repeatedly relapsed into, and clothed itself in Polytheism, while Mosaism in its recognition of the unity of God as the basis of its faith, ensured its own everlasting endurance.

But laying aside antithesis, let us consider the individual purport of Mosaism. What I have just advanced is confirmed by the first words of Scripture.

"In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth." God was, and created the world. God is, and the world is the consequence of His being; it has in Him its existence. It receives from Him its origin. God suffered it to be at first Tohu Vabohu, chaos, and then He developed in order and time the grand phenomena of nature; first its universal phenomenon, light; then the special elemental phenomena, expansion, water, earth; then the specific terrestrial phenomena of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, etc.; and lastly, the highest and most perfect speciality, Man. The great doctrines of Mosaism are therefore:—

- 1. God is absolute Being.
- 2. The Universe is His work, in that He operates the continual transformation of the *general* into the *special*.
- 3. God is beyond and superior to, or rather above, the Universe. God and nature are not identical; the latter is only His world, a combination of specialities, and not God, who is absolute.
 - 4. God as absolute essence is Unity.
- 5. The world is a Unity; in it everything harmonizes, all is necessary, all is good.

In the above established dogma, all the questions of antiquity are either precluded or answered. As the world is contemplated, not from the standard of man's egotism, but from the Universality of the Divine Author, the question as to salutary and pernicious influences can no longer be entertained. For these are relative terms, indicative of the egotistical standard of judgment erected by man, according to which the infinite consequences of the designs of a Divine Providence are made referable to man, his desires, and their gratification.

(That which in itself is good, may be hurtful to me: the wind which purifies the atmosphere of an entire province, may be to me an agent of destruction). Even in production and dissolution there dwells no antagonism; since both are resolvable into general existence. They occur in a speciality only, that is but a link severed from, and then re-united to, the great chain of the Universe. In accordance with the spirit of Mosaism, we find that the same word expresses both the world and eternity Div.* Neither can the question how the world, the 'Here', proceeded from the world 'Beyond', again arise, for the world is not out of God, but by means of God, whose appointment it is, that the general being shall ever develop itself into special existences.

Thus Mosaism teaches that God is an absolute Being אהיה אשר אהיה, consequently one and alone; above the world; Creator of the world; the unity of all specialities. God cannot therefore be a speciality, therefore is He incorporeal, and therefore He cannot be represented either in one of His works, or by a "likeness" the work of man's hands. For the same reason, because God is no speciality, is He holy, i.e., in Him all special properties resolve into one Universality, therefore also is He perfect. As God is absolute Being, He is of no time; He is eternal: a speciality only is born and dies. In like manner, He is unlimited in His being and power, Omnipresent and Omnipotent ("שר").

Thus by means of a comprehensive and intelligible agnition of the Divinity, Mosaism dismissed the vacant Yonder of the Indian, the Inscrutable of the Egyptian, the Necessity of the Sabean, the inexplicable Destiny of the Persian, and all the phases of philosophy to

^{* 1} Mos. 21-33.

which these correspond; and became, thereby, the most inflexible opponent of the corrupt refuge of these religions, Polytheism and Idolatry. Whatever truths had been discovered by these religions and philosphemes, were now resolvable into that 'truth' enunciated in Mosaism, which, while condemning their error, substituted for their want of consolation the strongest and deepest confidence and trust. At this point only, where the action of the philosophic religious systems of antiquity closes, does the mission of Mosaism in reality open.

The history of creation, as given in Scripture, must by no means be taken in a literal sense. It imparts to us only the great ideas, by which the creation is conceivable to our faculties. We learn that universal existence became gradually more special, and in this manner the whole progress of creation is rendered intelligible.

First there was chaos, then light, then expansion, etc. We are told how in process of time the Creation regularly developed itself:—that therefore God had thus set it forth from the beginning on certain fixed laws, from which, after different revolutions, a settled order, a cycle of life, proceeded. By the 'world,' Mosaism understands the aggregate of all specialities, existing by reason of the laws of nature established by God. At the head of these specialities, as the most perfect speciality, stands man. The perfection of speciality in him consists in this; that he is on one hand alone, in connection with the material Universality, consisting of the aggregate of all specialities, the world; while, on the other he returns to the absolute Universality—to God.

Mosaism ascribes to man a dual nature, formed of body and soul; but this duality is again a higher unity, as we shall have occasion to show hereafter. With reference to the creation of the lower animals, the scriptural phrase is, 'God created it,' but in the creation of man a two-fold act is announced: He formed him out of the dust of the earth, as a speciality of the material world, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; gave him His 'Spirit,' as it is said previously to the flood; 'my Spirit in men shall not always succumb.'* By this Spirit man is related to the absolute Universality-to God: 'Created in His image.'+ It follows, from the nature of Mosaism, that the image of the Deity in man can relate to the Spirit alone, as the repeated assertion that God is "God of the spirits of all flesh" clearly demonstrates.

This, my respected hearers, is the most important of all the teachings of Mosaism in reference to man, and the basis on which the whole fabric is erected, and by which its symmetry becomes most manifest: God's likeness to dualistic man, on the side of the Spirit. As the chief feature of this Divine likeness, Mosaism points to freedom and free agency. Man shall have dominion over all creatures around him: he assigns to them their names: Adam can eat of the forbidden fruit, but he can also abstain; Cain can act righteously, but also wickedly; again when the entire law was promulgated, the words ran, "Behold! I have put before thee Life and Death, choose Life." ‡ There is nowhere in Mosaism a trace of the invincible Necessity of the Sabeans, who believed the destiny of man to be influ-

^{* 1} Mos. 6, 3. † 1 Mos. 1, 27; 5, 1. ‡ 5 Mos. 11, 26; Ibid. 3—15, 19.

enced by the stars, nor of the inscrutable Destiny of the Persians, nor of the irrevocable Fate of the Greeks and Romans, to which even Jupiter and all the gods were subject. Mosaism declares man to be free and selfdetermining, for he bears the image of God.

But if the nature of man is dual, connected on one hand with the material world, and on the other with God; if his spirit is created in the likeness of God, and therefore free and self-determining, then it follows, that the aim and purport of his life must be to strive after a still greater resemblance to God, to promote the egress of the spirit from the bodily speciality, and make it approximate to the universal; to control the egotism of his physical nature; not like the Indian, to destroy it and place in its stead the egotism of a passive intellectual life :--to command and to regulate it, and to resolve it into the universal by the practice of love and justice. 'Be thou holy as the Lord thy God is holy.'* 'Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God.' † But this very freedom of man, this self-determining power, makes evil possible as well as good. He can give himself up to the egotism of his material nature; he can wantonly combat those influences which tend to stem the tide of his desires, and give free course to sensual passions, to anger, or to avarice. In a word, he can commit sin. Two kinds of sin are represented in Scripture, one showing the sensual nature of man in itself, and the other, the obstacle which society places to the indulgence of individual desires. In the one instance, man deviates from the destination divinely assigned to him, in the other he violates the right of his fellow-creature. These two phases of transgression are illustrated in the

^{* 3} Mos. 19, 2; 20, 7. + 5 Mos. 18, 13.

history of Paradise and the fratricide of Cain. In both instances, in the violation of God's command and of the right of his brother, man commits sin. The object of these narratives is to proclaim, not the origin of hereditary sin, in which the nullification of man's freedom and self-determining power would be involved, but the inherent possibility of sin in man. This possibility of sin is a consequence of man's dual nature, and of his freedom. Thus the question, 'How can sin exist in God's perfect world?' is answered in Mosaism by anticipation. Sin is not a universal, an absolute existence, but a condition of the individual in relation to himself, of which the effect is limited to that individual, and extends not to the universal. Indeed sin, as an attestation of the freedom and self-determining faculty of man, is considered from a general point of view, good. For the Persian, sin is a furtherance of the power of darkness, of the god of evil, Ahriman, and therefore of general import. In Mosaism, sin is merely a circumstance pertaining to the individual sinner, and entirely without general bearing. Sin is not the nature of man, but a possibility in the nature of man. Mosaism recognises man as the unity of body and spirit; by the former, linked to the egotism of material nature; in the latter, godlike, free and self-determining, consequently having the destination of nearer approximation to God, but also the possibility of sin.

Such are the teachings of Mosaism respecting God, the world and man. What is the relation which God holds to the world and to man?

The relation of God to the visible world He created, and to which He assigned fixed laws and order, by means of which it endures, is not identical with the relation He holds to man, made in His image, having the destination granted him of ever nearer approach to his Maker, yet possessing, by reason of his free will, the power of pursuing a contrary course.

For the better definition of our meaning we will make use of the terms direct and indirect. The Creator is in indirect relation with the world-it exists by reason of the immutable laws He established; but with the human soul, formed after His own likeness, He is in direct relation: for here there must be assumed on the part of the human mind a free development, and on the part of God a continual operation. That such a direct relation of God to man must exist, is self evident from the constitution of the human mind, and the thence deducible destination of man. God made him in His own image, thus in direct connection with Himself. But wherein consists this direct relation of God to man? 1st. In the continual providential guidance of the destiny of mankind. God having created man with the capability of realizing a certain ultimate destination, His design would fail were this destination not attained. and this seems to be illustrated in the record we have of the generation living at the time of the Deluge. If therefore the design of the Creator is to be carried into effect, He must lead man, whose freedom of action renders a contrary result possible, in the way of its accomplishment. This principle is declared in every page of the Mosaic writings. The guidance of individual men, the divine hand in their destiny, is everywhere averred in solemn, striking, words. Here also repeated indications are found of the divine conduct of all the people of the earth towards religious and social perfection, an idea of which the final enunciation

was conveyed by the prophets. In the pre-mosaic history, however, Mosaism makes significant allusions to this providential guidance, in the narrative of the Tower of Babel and in the biography of Joseph. How this guidance of man's destiny accords with his freedom and free agency as arbiter of his own fate, is a question answered by anticipation in Mosaism. God ordains the outward conditions which are to form his sphere of action; his birth, family and possessions are of His appointment; within that sphere, man's course is left free; by reason of the fore-knowledge of all human actions, which is an unfailing attribute of the Omniscient, events are so directed that they reach their appointed end. By means of their free agency the brethren of Joseph sold him into slavery; but God so ordered all things that this act resulted in the salvation, by Joseph's instrumentality, of an entire nation from famine, and in the translation of Jacob's family into the land of Egypt.

The second condition of the direct relation of God to man is 'that God is the Judge of the actions of men.' Having given him a destination, He must provide, that on the furtherance of this, His work, as on every interruption of the same, the due respective consequences shall follow. Mosaism teaches this in the most emphatic language; and here again we must revert to the view of sin given in Mosaism. Sin is a quality that relates to the individual himself, and is without any essential existence in the Universe or created world. This condition therefore can be changed or altogether removed. The sinner can return to virtue; and like alternations must be possible in respect of the

^{* 1} Mos. 45. 5. 50. 20.

effects of sin. The punishment must take place, but the sinner must be forgiven when he returns to virtue. God is Judge, and cannot permit sin to be unpunished, but He is also merciful, and will forgive the guilt of the penitent. This apparent contradiction is in Mosaism prominently asserted, and beautifully solved. It proclaims, in repeated instances, that 'the Everlasting is a merciful and gracious God, long suffering, and of infinite goodness and truth, who forgiveth iniquity, transgression and sin, yet will not suffer the guilty to go unpunished, and remembereth the sins of the fathers, on the children and children's children.' It is well known that a sentiment of pseudo-charity and exaggerated love has often made this last expression-'Visiting the sins, etc...shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love him, and keep his commandments,'-the object of attack, without its being remembered that these words, superficially considered, present too apparent a contradiction not to indicate that the real meaning is to be sought somewhat deeper. If we consider real life, (and this, it will be admitted, is the highest test of the truth of a doctrine), do we not at once perceive numberless cases where the descendants suffer from the material consequences of the crimes of their progenitors? The parents living in excess, beget a race that brings into the world the seeds of debility and death. The dishonour of the father presses down the fortunes of the son-the spendthrift makes his heir a beggar-Louis XVI., a kind and good man, is guillotined for the sins of his predecessors. Thus we see that reality confirms the truth of the emphatic assertion of Mosaism. It will be stated in reply, that this process of retribution is but natural and just: the material consequences follow directly

upon the sin, and God, in His conduct of man's destiny, permits these consequences to be visible. Yes: this is the solution. As Judge, God suffers the natural consequences to follow upon sin, and thus leaves it not uncondemned. But sin is not only a material act, it is also a condition of the soul in relation to God. It has interrupted and checked the soul of man in its approach to its Maker; it is God's mercy that calls the penitent, that forgives transgression, removes the obstacles in his path, and brings the sinner's soul back to Himself. Such is the doctrine of Mosaism; it declares that God as Judge, leaves nothing unpunished, and permits sin to have its natural result; but that in His mercy He forgives guilt and recalls sinners to Himself. This direct relation of God to man, finds in Mosaism its truest and most unequivocal expression.

3rdly, 'God hath revealed Himself.' Revelation is assumed throughout the whole of the Mosaic writings. At first it is introduced by the inspired penman with a simple affirmative יאכר הי 'God spake'; afterwards historically, as he himself is taught. Throughout the whole period of his mission, he is ever conscious of being the recipient of the revelation, for not alone does Moses remind the people that 'from heaven He hath let thee hear His voice in order to teach thee,' but in Num. xii., he fully explains the different kinds of divine revelation, and in other passages he enumerates the conditions of true revelation, and the signs by which it may be known to be divine; namely, that it contain nothing which shall contradict the previously-revealed conception of the Divine Being; as, for instance, the representation of the Deity in any form, or the doctrine of more gods than one. That according to the spirit of

Mosaism, our notion of revelation be neither feeble nor false, is provided for from the very commencement. Mosaism unquestionably comprehends under this head; 1st, the declaration of general fixed principles to the people; and, 2ndly, the direct agency and inspiration of God finding utterance in the representations and convictions of certain chosen men. The essential quality, however, is, that divine revelation in Mosaism is neither an accidental circumstance nor an adopted costume, a garment laid aside at will, without the essence clothed being thereby affected. Men are too much accustomed to look on revelation in Mosaism as the modus rerum narrandarum only, as the style of the report having no relation to its purport and its truth. But this is not the case. Revelation is an integral part, the corner-stone of Mosaism. God having given to man a spirit after His own likeness, with the destination of continual approximation to his Maker, having made man free and self-determining, and as a necessary consequence of that freedom, exposed to the possibility of pursuing a course opposite to his true destination; a further necessary consequence was, that God should make known Truth to His creatures, as without it they would wander in constant error, fall short of the aim of their being, and at length come to misery and despair, as the history of an antiquity devoid of revelation has shown.

It was necessary that mankind should pass through their various and peculiar phases of development, attain whatever their nature was qualified to accomplish, and in order generally to fit them for the acceptance of the truth, that their development should be wholly unfettered. For this reason, divine revelation did not go forth at once to the whole world, but was entrusted to a small people, chosen and reared for this purpose. Mosaism then considers revelation as the perfect direct relation of God to Man. God were but partly in direct relation, if He only conducted the destinies of men, judged their actions and forgave their sins; for here, as with the government of other creatures, merely fixed laws, though of a higher order, would obtain. God having, however, created the spirit of man after His own image, thereby placed man in direct relation to Himself, and must in as direct a manner unfold the truth to his view. By means of, and in revelation, God is in direct relation to man; therefore revelation is not a modus only, but an integral part of that doctrine, whose very essence is the direct relation of God to man. That God conducts the destinies of men and judges their actions, is only proved and shown in His having also directly revealed to him the truth. But for revelation, the divine government of human affairs could be but supposed and assumed.

And now, at the conclusion, we must revert to the beginning. We have seen that Mosaism went forth from God to the world, and to men. How did it effect this? Because the God of Mosaism is a revealed God. The knowledge of God is not acquired by means of speculation, for then it must have first arisen in man, proceeded from him to the world, and thence have reached to God, to be finally lost in the phases of the religions and philosophemes of paganism. Mosaism knows God, and by means of this realized God, it receives its knowledge of the world and of men. Mosaism knows God, because God has made Himself known to Mosaism. Mosaism demands that the Divine

Being be comprehended, not discovered, by the intellect; therefore do we repeatedly meet with the injunction to "know God." Human intelligence did not first find Him, but received Him by means of revelation. The whole truth of Mosaism thus demands a divine revelation, which revelation is explained previously by the declaration of the creation of man in the image of God. In demanding that fact, revelation declares its possibility.

Were I here, my friends, to give not only a history, but arguments in proof of Judaism, I should have to answer a number of objections to which the so-called rational view of the subject would at this point give rise. But I have to adhere strictly to history, by which, perhaps, in its course, these unsolved remaining questions will be best answered. In this place I desired only to prove by means of Mosaism itself, the absolute necessity of Revelation to Mosaism.

We have therefore clearly defined the doctrine of God as declared in Mosaism, in contradistinction to the dualistic systems of antiquity. Mosaism proclaimed:—

- 1. God is absolute Being.
- ·2. The world is His creation, in which the universal by degrees becomes special.
- 3. God is superior to and beyond the world, one and alone, incorporeal, holy, eternal, omnipresent and omnipotent.
- 4. Man is the unity of body and spirit; his spirit created in the image of God, with the destination of ever nearer approximation to God, free and self-determining, with the possibility of sin.
- 5. God is in direct relation to man, in that He conducts him towards perfection, is judge of his actions, the consequences of which He permits to appear; but

cancels the guilt of the penitent, and has revealed to him the truth.

This is 'the religious idea,' as Mosaism introduced it into the world, which, notwithstanding continued antagonism, has ever since been extending its dominion over mankind. The unity of God; the unity of the world; the unity of man: the indirect relation of God to the world by virtue of nature's laws; His direct relation to man, by providence, judgment, and revelation.

LECTURE III.

ON THE SOCIAL MORALITY OF MOSAISM.

In our examination of the morality of the social constitution of Mosaism, we must direct our attention especially to two points-1st. It establishes that man, in all his relations, is a unity, and that each of his component parts, having one and the same point of departure, is to be collaterally and equally developed. Further, the ideal in Mosaism differs not from the real, nor the doctrine from the life, nor the cultivation of head and heart from the line of action. By firmly establishing these first principles, Mosaism clears the road, by which their realisation may be attempted and achieved. Therefore all extremes, that would force human effort beyond the limit of human power and capacity, are foreign to, and unknown in, Mosaism. In it religion is not a thing apart from life 'here,' on earth, an ideal world, into which man retires, and in which he abstracts himself for an hour's brief space, and whence he emerges, without substantial or direct guidance, to re-enter the actual world of men, wherein all appears to contradict that ideal world of religion.

On the contrary, in Mosaism the entire life is religion, and religion is the entire life: out of it, a religious

'Here' is to issue; therefore it does not merely treat of, but actually develops out of itself, alike morality and the law of society, alike virtue and right.

2. As Mosaism was addressed originally to one particular race, under particular circumstances, and at a certain period of the world's history, it not only establishes general fixed principles, but invests them in certain specific ordinances (a garb suited to the age and people), forming a comprehensive code of national laws, from which we have to extract the essential general thoughts and purport. For the attainment of this end, we must now often depart from the Mosaic letter, in order to seize the Mosaic spirit. We should further lay down two rules for our guidance in the performance of our task, viz.-We must carefully deduce the general design from the specific provisions; and, secondly, time and circumstances being duly weighed, we must discard that, and that only, which appertains exclusively to them-we must faithfully adhere to, and retain that, which appertains equally to all times and circumstances.

What, then, is the leading and highest principle of morals in Mosaism? It declares man to be created in the image of God; therefore is the deduction manifest, that the command, "Ye shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy," * is the first and highest principle of Mosaic morality. From this first principle three conclusions may be drawn—

1. Mosaism places the ground-work of all good, not in man, but in God. Hence what is good in God is good in man also; and man shall do good, because it is good in the sight of God. By these axioms incalculably much is achieved. In the first place, all human doubts

and uncertainty are dispelled. By these means alone, in fact, we clearly perceive and know what is good, since from God only all individuality is absent; in Him alone no egotism can exist. In the second place, the aim of the good is fully determined, that aim being declared to be, not contentment (after all, but a refined egotism), but approximation to God.

- 2. Formal, external sanctification cannot here be the matter in question, the holiness of man being referred to the holiness of God. This sanctification is not to be effected by the ceremonial of religion: it is not an act of divine worship, but the life practical and spiritual, since in the sight of God, in no forms, but in attributes and deeds, consists "holiness." In accordance with this principle, the sanctification of the life and the spirit constitutes man's "holiness."
- 3. This principle again comprehends that of the unity of man. Religious morality and social life are not presented to us in Mosaism, as distinct entities, having an ideal, but not a real and intimate union; on the contrary, holiness includes them all, for this god-like holiness admits not of religion without morality, nor of morality without social virtue, but requires that the same character prevail throughout all these phases of life.

Let us now examine this Holiness in the minutest details in which it has reference to the individual relations of every human being, and we shall perceive that in Mosaism man is universally an independent self-determining creature, a being endued with independent natural powers and rights. Mosaism in no way requires of man self-abnegation, the sacrifice of his individuality; on the contrary, it elevates that individuality to its

highest possible position. Throughout Mosaism consequently, this Holiness is but another term for love, with which it is identical; for love is not self-sacrifice, love is self-devotion. This self-devotion is the true manifestation of the individuality of, as the bestowal of gifts presupposes possession in, the giver. Of man subject to the law of love, one undivided feeling pervades and permeates the whole being, and inasmuch as he thereby becomes entirely self-conscious of his own nature, insomuch is that being exalted and refined. Mosaism therefore declares the first and highest principle of man's relation to his God to be,-"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might."* The individuality of man under all its conditions even in his relation to his God, is, in this comprehensive enumeration, most emphatically recognised, (with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might), while it at the same time demands that such individuality should merge into self-devotion to that God.

Just so is it with the relation of man to his fellow-men,—'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;'† here again the individuality of the individual man as thyself, is asserted and fully justified, but the love shall in like manner operate as self-devotion. Man shall self-devote himself to his neighbour, as he does naturally to himself. Thus while all self-inflicted torments and all self-denying asceticism are opposed to the spirit, and unknown in the letter of the Mosaic code, Mosaism elevates its follower to the loftiest position in which man is still man endowed with all the rights of man, but in which man, for the attainment of the end

and aim of his being, must practise not self-annihilation, but self-devotion. At the option of the individual therefore, are left the exercise of private devotion, and attendance at public worship. This assertion may, prima facie, appear strange, if not startling, since the law of Moses contains the most minute and stringent enactments for the order and regulation of divine worship. But the Mosaic ordinances for the sacrifices and the worship, referred to, and were intended for, not the individual, but the whole people of Israel. There was to be one general sanctuary for the whole nation, (in a country 500 square miles in extent, one only) in which sacrifices were to be offered in the name of all the people. No sacrifice, no prayer, is prescribed to the individual man. He can bring free-will offerings,* he can vow vows, but he is not compelled so to do. Thus the Mosaic worship is but the image or representation of the intimate general religious connection of the whole people of Israel; and the circumstances in which the individual is commanded to bring a sacrifice as a sin-offering, are in fact only those in which he has committed some offence against the above-named general national religious union, (its object not being to generate by means of observances, a religious frame of mind and spirit in the individual); or (as in the instances of the Paschal lamb and the firstlings of the flock) it is done as a public recognition by the individual, of the religious connection that obtained throughout the community.

A new light + is shed on the Mosaic worship when

^{* 3} Mos. 22. 17, 18.

[†] I here venture to submit to the reader an impression early produced by a general view of the Mosaic sacrificial system, and

viewed from this point. On the individual it is imperative only, to love God, reverence God, to serve Him and

subsequently wholly confirmed by close examination of its numerous, ample, and detailed enactments. It is advanced, that this system of sacrifices was in fact in Palestine, theoretically and practically, a comprehensive system of national charity, a grand code of 'national poor laws,' if I may use the term.

First. 1It was a provision for one-twelfth of the people, among whose numbers were the priests, physicians, teachers, and ministers of domestic devotion, who had 2no portion in Israel. ³Secondly. The things sacrificed or devoted by the mass, were to be applied to the support of the poor, the fatherless and the widow, and the stranger within the gates. Thirdly. A portion was to be set apart, and the enjoyment of these gifts of God was to be an especial act of grateful devotion on the part of their possessor. These last mentioned enactments make it self-evident again, that with the word "sacrifice" is connected in modern times and in living languages, an idea totally different from that which Moses intended it should convey. Its recent and present acceptation is the abandonment of something either physically or mentally agreeable, of a pleasure or enjoyment for the sake of some duty to God or man, to be fulfilled by that abandonment. In the law contained in Deuteronomy, xvii, 11 and 13; also xxvi. 10, 11, 12, 13, as in truth in the whole chapter, sacrifice is synonymous with enjoyment for the sacrificer; enjoyment alike material and spiritual; since with the enjoyment of that which satisfies his material appetites and tastes, are associated the two highest and purest of all spiritual or moral enjoyments. It brings with it namely, approximation to God, as the earthly agent and distributor of His rich gifts to men, and individual gratitude to the giver of all good, whose expression is, as the ultimate act of worship, not pain but joy. 5 "Ye shall rejoice before your God."

In order to avoid if possible extending these remarks beyond the limits of a foot-note, I have abstained from textually quoting

¹ 3 Mos. 10. 14; 5 Mos. 18, 1.

^{2 4} Mos. 18. 20, 21; Ibid 30—32. 3 5 Mos. 16. 11—14; Ibid 26. 11, 12, 18. 4 5 Mos. 12. 6—12; Ibid 17—21; 5 Mos. 14. 22—29. 5 5 Mos. 26. 11, 12, 13.

to cling to Him, in order to show forth holiness in the life and in the spirit;* but by what manner and mode of worship and prayer, each man is free to choose.

The fulfilling of the command, to love your fellowman, is to be accomplished in our two-fold relation; first, in that to the individual, and secondly, in that to the aggregate of these individuals composing the community.

In the first relation, this love negatives its antagonisms. † Hatred and revenge must be banished, even from the depths of the heart. True Mosaism effects this; it tends also to counteract the influence exercised by these passions on human actions, and gives as an example thereof, that, "‡ If thou meetest thine enemy's

the passages alluded to. I bespeak the patience of the reader for their verification and perusal. He will find that in no instance has their teaching been inferred, or their purport strained. I have farther to adduce as confirmatory, circumstantial historical evidence, the passage of the 1st book of Samuel, chap, ii, from the 12th to the 17th ver. Among the sinful dealings of the sons of Eli, there is set forth their appropriating to themselves more than the priests' portion of the sacrifices. This clearly shows that even in the time of the Judges, and before the erection of the temple as the one depôt for the national offerings, adherence to the benevolent ordinances of the Mosaic code in the partition of such offerings was enforced, and their infringement by the officiating priest, regarded as a heavy iniquity. I might further enlarge upon the mercy which counteracted the possible action of selfishness and made it a condition that not the worst but the best should be selected and set apart, in common parlance sacrificed,—things wholly pure, and therefore fit for edible purposes .-- A. M. G.

^{* 5} Mos. 10. 12.

^{† 3} Mos. 19. 17, 18.—"Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in anywise rebuke thy neighbour and not suffer sin upon him, &c.

^{‡ 2} Mos. 23. 4, 5; 5 Mos. 22. 1, 2.

ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back again to him, if thou seest the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help him." Justice and compassion are the positive expressions of this love. Thus Mosaism not only strictly forbids any infringement of the former, but insists forcibly on an inflexible and strenuous antagonism to all manner of injustice, fraud, oppression, violence, bribery, false testimony, respect of persons, perjury, false weights and measures, and the like. Yet more, it does not merely counsel the exercise of mercy and compassion in a set of well-turned, poetically tender precepts, but by means the most practical and direct, it elevates charity into a binding legal obligation. To this point, my hearers, permit me now to call your attention.

The ultimate and direct relation, established by Mosaism between God and man, which leads the latter to perceive that the principle of all that is good dwells in God, must also make it manifest that God is the source of all justice; and that by the fulfilment of the command, "That which is wholly right and just shall ve do," * man maintains this intimate and direct connexion with God. In His law, God has defined what is just. God is ever the abstract and instrument of all good, and of universal morality. Doing what is right is therefore reverence to God; transgression against the right, transgression against God, of which God takes cognizance, and which He punishes. Mosaism also establishes individual freedom and self-dependence, and gives expression to their validity in love. God has also, by means of His law, brought the knowledge of the

^{* 5} Mos. 16. 20.

right clearly before the consciousness of mankind, so that they know how to distinguish between good and evil. The laws of Moses rest upon, and result from, the conformity of these two propositions. dwells in God; injustice is an infringement of this divine general morality. Man is called upon, as God's agent, to enquire into and punish committed wrong-"Ye shall remove evil from the midst of you, that the whole land be not accursed."* In Mosaism, therefore, human justice is administered in the name of God; and the judge, fully sensible of his self-dependence, is equally self-conscious that he knows, and is bound to administer, the justice of God. Proof must be obtained, by means of human witnesses, in order that the judge may decide between the innocent and the guilty. The chastisement, of which the object is, not to produce terror, but to re-establish infringed public morality, must correspond with the offence. Therefore, Mosaism nowhere permits appeals to so-called divine intervention, nor admits into its code supernatural punishments and ordeals. Divine judgments, such as are recorded in the annals of antiquity and the middle ages, and are allowed by the Koran, are unknown in Mosaism. The rack and torture, that disgraced Europe till the middle of the last century, and ransoms for the murderer, accepted among the Greeks and Germans, and permitted by the Koran, are equally forbidden. By it are expressly denied the right of the parent over the life of the child, of the master over that of the slave, the participation of the children and relatives in the punishment of the culprit.+ The tribunals were open and public, the judicial proceedings were conducted verbally, in presence and under

^{* 5} Mos. 17. 7, 12.

the presidency of the elders of the community.* Regard for the dignity of man was a chief element of Mosaic justice. "The body of him who had been hanged was not to hang until the morning."

In referring to the laws respecting charity, compassion, and benevolence, we find that Mosaism declares, that the portion of the produce of the soil it adjudged to the poor, belonged to them as a right. Man receives the ground from God; through the blessing of that God, his labour is crowned with an abundant harvest. God transfers His claim to a portion of that harvest to the poor. To them Mosaism distributes, as their due, the spontaneous produce of every seventh year,—the fallow or Sabbatical year,—the second tithe of every third and sixth year, all that grew in the corners of the field, all that fell from the hand of the reaper, all forgotten sheaves and shocks, the gleaning of the olivetree and vineyard.† This selection of alms, being all of the "fruit of the ground," was entirely adapted to the then constitution of the people of Israel, as a nation of husbandmen. But according to the spirit of the law of Moses, the form of those gifts must everywhere accommodate itself to the altered circumstances of the Israelites in other lands, and the laws apply equally to the fruits of industry and commerce. It may be objected, that a charity, legally enacted, is, in fact, a forced compulsory benevolence. In reply, the wellknown truth may be urged, that the tone and habit of thought of a whole people are not unfrequently influenced, if not, indeed, wholly generated, by the tendencies of the laws by which they are governed. The legal regulation of the distribution of alms must

have established the claim of the poor thereto, and rendered it in the eyes of the people, not an abstract, but a real and positive right, whose recognition must have been far more permanently beneficial in effect, than could have been any mere theoretical precepts of charity.

Besides, some only of these enactments fix the exact measure of contribution, others leave it free to be determined by the benevolent tendencies of individual character.

Finally, works of mercy and charity are not limited by Mosaism to the above-named. It is made an especial duty* to lend to the poor, even without prospects of its restoration, all that he needs. For example, Mosaism ordains that the garment of the poor shall not be kept over night as a pledge, that the sun shall not go down on the hire of the labourer and the like.

If we now proceed to examine the social constitution of Mosaism, we shall at once perceive that it presents clear general outlines, which outlines are filled in with details immediately applicable to the people of Israel. We must again remember, that Mosaism proceeds from "one only God," in whose image man is created, that its first moral principle is, "Thou shalt be holy for the Lord thy God is holy;" and in man's relation to his fellow-men, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." A necessary consequence is, that it establishes complete equality among all members of the body-politic. This equality is carried out, first, in equality of civil rights. In Mosaism there exists no distinction of class, order, rank, or property. Moses chose from among the people, it is true, princes, heads of houses, chiefs of the

tribes, captains over thousands, captains over hundreds, and over tens, elders and judges. But this was done solely for the necessary regulation and execution of public business. These appointments were strictly and in all cases individual, and in no instance hereditary. This is everywhere confirmed in the Mosaic annals. No trace of the sons or the posterity of Moses is to be found, their existence being lost amidst the records of the tribes. "When Moses established a sanctuary* he received from each one of the people half a shekelthe rich shall not give more, the poor shall not give less." It may be objected, that Moses established in one tribe, † and in one family of that tribe, an hereditary priesthood. Admitted; but of 'political' power they were deprived. Their sole and distinct vocation was, to be the executive of the national worship, the exponents of the doctrine of Moses; and this was a late enactment, adopted only when an attempt to commit the fulfilment of these duties to the first-born in every family had proved abortive. Therefore Moses provided a counteraction to the acquisition by the priesthood, of undue social and political influence, by depriving the whole tribe of Levi, "of any portion in Israel," that is, of any landed property, and thus making them to depend for their very subsistence+ on the favourable disposition towards them of the mass of the people. Mosaism extends the equality thus established among the people themselves, to all who dwelt in the land. The civil rights enjoyed by Israelites were shared by all strangers who inhabited the country. The very exceptions provided for in the cases of the eunuchs and bastards (which grew out of the habits of the age) of

^{* 2} Mos. 30, 15. + 4 Mos. 18, 20; 5 Mos. 18, 1.

the Moabite and Ammonite, prove the otherwise uniform application of the law.

This equality of civil rights, to be enjoyed alike by the Israelites and the strangers* dwelling among them, is again and again solemnly and emphatically declared in the law of Moses. In no respect did a distinction exist, or was any privilege permitted either between Israelite and Israelite (even the priests were amenable to the same laws as the laity, and no altar had a right of sanctuary)† or between the Israelite and the stranger or refugee—the latter being subjected to no restriction or civil disabilities whatever.‡ This equality was realized in the personal freedom of every member of the state.

Mosaism again solemnly urges "Ye shall be free, ye shall not be bondsmen." At the head of the fundamental laws, the Ten Commandments, personal freedom is especially declared, "who brought thee out of the house of bondage." Doubtless, to the development of this freedom, the slavery which was an institution common to all antiquity, presented a powerful obstacle. But Mosaism sought, by the introduction of laws whose tendency is clearly perceptible to us, partly to mitigate this system, and partly to remove it altogether. It therefore transforms the slaves into hirelings, whose servitude is to continue for a certain term of years, as is expressly stated, the slave is to be manumitted at the beginning of the seventh year from his purchase, and likewise in the year of jubilee, without ransom.

^{* 3} Mos. 19. 34; 2 Mos. 12. 49; 4 Mos. 15. 15, 16, 29. † 2 Mos. 21. 14. ‡ 3 Mos. 25. 47.

^{§ 3} Mos. 25, 54, 55. | 3 Mos. 25. 39, 40.

He is to go free and to be furnished liberally with presents of sheep, of corn and of wine. The exercise of severity towards the slave is strictly forbidden, and his punishment prevented by law. Any corporeal injury received by the slave entitled him to his immediate freedom. Nor must we forget to state, that the restoration of a runaway slave to his owner was not allowed; on the contrary, he was to dwell where it seemed unto him good.* Whatever loss of personal freedom was involved in a change of material circumstances, was rendered temporary by the restitution 'in integrum,' of the year of jubilee, when all were restored to freedom.

But Mosaism promotes this equality by its constant tendency to produce equality of possessions. While legislating only on the property of the community, Mosaism was far removed from the erroneous notion that individual possession was to be superseded. On the contrary, the basis on which the structure of the national life was erected, was the equal division of the soil. It sought to counteract the inordinate accumulation by individuals of wealth and landed property, to check pauperism, in fine, to reach the ideal of securing the rights of private property, of leaving its acquisition free to all, and yet at the same time of protecting it from degenerating into the two extremes-of riches and poverty. The groundwork of this Moses placed in the national consciousness, that the people held possession of the soil as a tenure from God. And by what means did he endeavour to accomplish this? He divided the

^{*} It were well if those who seek, at the present day, to justify their tenure of slaves by the sanction of Scripture, were to implicitly obey that Scripture's enactments (see 5 Mos. 23. 15—16): slavery would virtually disappear, without the passing of an act for its abolition.—A. M. G.

land by lot into inalienable hereditary portions, first for each tribe, then into subdivisions, according to their generations and to their families.* These last could be alienated+ but only for a term of years. In the year of jubilee all inheritances were gratuitously restored and the hereditary claimant was to re-enter into possession; and, secondly, the seller, or one of his kin, retained the right of redeeming the property at any period, taking due account of the years yet to elapse before the year of jubilee. Thus, as is remarked in the Bible itself, the sale was only a lease granted for a specific term of years, and the year of jubilee necessitated the restitution in integrum to the original owners, so that the people in that year were replaced in a condition of territorial equality of property. But Mosaism did yet more, it offered the most strenuous opposition to that greatest, that fundamental evil, in all civil relationships, the system of debtor and creditor. It started on the presumption that all debt was occasioned by need on the part of the borrower, by want of some necessary of life, so that it was, in fact, a duty enforced by the love of his fellow-men, that he who possessed should give freely to the necessitous, unless by so doing he should become equally impoverished. The Bible expresses this almost in so many words, But if the giver retains the right of demanding the restoration of what he has given, so that it becomes not a gift but a loan, it follows from the presumption above referred to, that the lender is to derive no specific pecuniary advantage from the transaction. Thus Mosaism forbids all kind of interest, whether in money or in kind. (It is self-evident that this restriction could not be ex-

^{* 4} Mos. 34, 13.

tended to foreigners, for such extension would have rendered impossible all commerce with other nations).

2. At the end of every seventh year all debts were to be cancelled eo ipso, so that the creditor had no right to restitution. It is manifest that this again prevented any one incurring pecuniary obligations of vast magnitude, for which, moreover, Mosaism did not recognise the necessity.* It was consequently impossible that one individual should inherit enormous landed possessions to be his for ever, or that a family should finally lose its patrimonial estates. It was impossible that any one should enrich himself with borrowed money; or should, by an accumulation of debt, by interest and dowry, involve himself in wholesale and entire ruin. Thus pauperism and overgrown wealth were alike entirely obviated. Let it not be objected, that the Israelites themselves failed to obey these laws. As in respect of the doctrine of the unity of God, they were not ripe either to understand or to fulfil them. Mosaism confided to the Israelites, a doctrine and a law, the comprehension of which in all their purity was reserved for later times, as is their entire fulfilment in practice, for ages yet more remote. The Israelites were to be their preservers for this 'Future', and have faithfully performed this mission at the price of unspeakable sacrifices. The perplexities and confusion that at present prevail throughout human society, were actually generated by a system directly opposed in principle to Mosaism. They, therefore, offer no standard whatever by which Mosaic law may be measured. That they, on the contrary, may be duly understood, we must keep the fact in view, that they proceed from the present necessities of mankind,

and can be remedied only by a process of gradual slow development and improvement. To demonstrate this is not our present task. It is enough for us to show, that Mosaism originates the principles of a truly religious municipal society, and that its realisation in practice is the appointed task of a remote future.

You will be desirous of ascertaining what form of government was established by Mosaism. It here again remained true to its leading principle of freedom, and dictated no specific form. It correctly distinguishes between civil society as the essence, and the constitution as the form, which latter must vary, not only according to the requirements of different nations, but according to the varying exigencies of different ages, in the existence of one and the same nation. In the Mosaic writings we seek in vain for a specific 'form of government' - a constitution for the state. Certainly, its governmental and social principles tend rather to the production of a republican government than of any other, of which Mosaism recognises a necessary head in the person, indifferently of a judge or a general, or a high priest, without pronouncing definitively on the matter, since it places the priest* and the judge in juxta-position, and scarcely adverts to their mutual relation.

It even predicts the demand arising for a monarchical form of government, thus—†" When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger

^{. . 5} Mos. 17. 9.

over thee, which is not thy brother,"* etc. As Mosaism so repeatedly proscribes the laws and customs of the nations "that are around thee" in all other matters, this one exception is worthy of all note. Moses proceeds here on the idea that the people either live in strict accordance with the doctrine and the law that have been revealed to them, or else forsake them. In the first case, no constitution would be productive to them of injury; in the second, none could benefit them. A fixed form of government would, therefore, have been a useless restriction, which might have become, subsequently, highly prejudicial in its operation. We must here clearly distinguish the circumstances obtaining in the time of Moses, and those prevailing in that of Samuel, and not attribute to the former, the opinions of the latter. In short, Mosaism places society, by means of its system of morals, on a firm basis, and leaves the form of government free, while presupposing that form to be republican. It divides the people into tribes, generations, families; further, into sections of 10, 100, and 1000. It assumes that the elders and priests are to be the judges and rulers; but it bestows the right to these offices, the supremacy over the people, on no one family, or generation, or race. The best qualified for the performance of these public duties was to be chosen "out of the midst of the people," as the one called to the superior rule or presidency over the people, whether as judge or king. Nothing more specific is to be found.

^{*} If all the crowned kings took to heart the simple teaching of the king's duty, as set forth in the closing verses of the chapter, would not the conflicts between nation and nation, and between sovereigns and their people, which up to this hour make the world's history a blood-stained record, be among the things of the past ?—A. M. G.

It need scarcely be observed, that the true direction of the national destinies of the people of Israel is uniformly regarded by Moses as vested in God alone,—as all circumstances relating to the people are referable solely to Him. A theocracy which should form a part of the state, or executive government, was the ideal creation of Samuel, and was not instituted by Moses. Nothing, be it here remarked, more clearly demonstrates the authenticity of the Pentateuch than this apparent omission, since it thereby provided for the mutations, which all subsequent changes of material and political circumstances were sure to induce.

If we further call to mind that Mosaism especially regards 'the family' as the basis of its society, out of which it springs, and on which it is to flourish, a new and peculiar light is cast over our entire previous statement. Mosaism urges repeatedly on the attention of the people, that all its members spring from one ancestor. כני ישראל is the national appellation. It carefully preserves the division into tribes, and thus provides against the passing of the real property of one, into the possession of any other tribe. It maintains the sub-divisions within these tribes into generations and families. The above fundamental laws become the more intelligible, when the soil on which they are planted is remembered, the consciousness of the people naturally producing equality and brotherly affection. Nor shall we be surprised to find that Mosaism zealously promotes family love. It regards the filial and conjugal relations as its ground-work. Both are sanctified in the Decalogue. An infringement of the obedience and reverence due to parents, is a capital crime; to scoff at and blaspheme them, is to scoff at and blaspheme God. Moses teaches that marriage is an institution appointed directly by God: Adam received his wife as a creation direct from God. The merging of all individual into one common interest in marriage, is exquisitely expressed.* The inviolability of marriage begins from the moment of betrothal, and its violation is a capital crime. Marriages, it is true, can be annulled, if they do not fulfil their higher design; but divorce requires a legal procedure, while the marriage promise requires none, to render it binding.

Mosaism, therefore, protected the marriage relation with laws requiring the strictest and purest chastity. It opposed the moral depravity of the Asiatic and African nations with ardent zeal. It strictly forbade all intercourse without the pale of marriage, and uncompromisingly excluded prostitution from among the people. It re-asserted the deep and significant natural character of the conjugal tie, by prohibiting marriage between persons who spring, whether contemporaneously or successively, from the same stock. It promoted fraternal and family ties of affection, and enforced the duty of redeeming from sale both the persons and the property of kindred.

In a system that considered the entire nation as a unity, and human morality as a whole, it was impossible that the relation of man to the animal creation could be left undefined. While granting to man 'the rule over all the creatures of the earth,' Mosaism at the same time considers the relation of man to the animal, nay, even to the vegetable kingdom, to have a deep significance, and limits his dominion over them by certain legal restrictions. That growth of recent times,

^{* 1} Mos. 2, 24.

the laws against cruelty to animals, was thus early (if not so materially and circumstantially expressed) a peculiarity of the code of Moses.

The law of nature, as the work of God, is sacred in Mosaism, and everything opposed to nature is a desecration of God's work. Thus to sow the same field with different kinds of grain, to mutilate animals, and to permit the crossing of different species, are forbidden. Mosaism prohibits, therefore, seething the kid in the milk of the mother, as in the material destined to support its life by the Creator, killing the mother and her young on the same day, taking the parent bird and the eggs at the same time from the nest. Therefore Mosaism ordains that the beast of the field shall share man's sabbath of rest, and that the ox shall not be muzzled when he treads out the corn, etc. From all these, and many other similar special enactments, we have to deduce the general principle, that it is an infringement of the law of God to do that which is opposed to nature, and that the exercise of mercy towards the brute is the duty of man. The manner in which these ordinances are expressed, and sometimes reiterated, proves that they were considered by Moses as an important portion of the law, and that their object was to ensure and to develop, in this respect, the morality of the human race.

Having thus considered man in his relation to God, to his fellow-men, and to the animal and vegetable kingdom, we resume the subject of the individuality or personality of man. It is manifest, that to it the first principle, "Be thou holy, as the Lord thy God is holy," is especially applicable.

How does Mosaism understand this sanctification?

It is self-evident that Mosaism does not consider duty and right to be something external, but to consist in the spiritual resemblance of man to God; that it refers all man's relations to God, to the world, and his fellow being, to his inward individual nature; and as significant as it is sublime, is the concluding and crowning command of the Decalogue, of which the object is the purification of the very recesses of the human heart. 'Thou shalt not covet the wife of thy neighbour,' etc.

If, therefore, to acknowledge God, to be filled with that knowledge, to love God, to confide in Him, to love your neighbour, and to put all these high motives and feelings into action by strictly fulfilling the revealed law, constitute this sanctification in general (and that these do constitute it, the Mosaic writings repeatedly and emphatically declare), if, as the fifth book of the Pentateuch earnestly urges on the hearts of men, these general conditions form the true life which blesses and renders man happy here below, certain it is that the special fundamental idea of Mosaism is this-'To sublimate the moral consciousness of man above all things sensual and temporal, and to secure by these means the dominion of mankind over things sensual and temporal.' Thence it follows, that Mosaism, regarding man as a unity, cannot stop short at holiness of spirit, but must secure a like holiness in the life material and of the senses. Let us examine, first, what refers to these senses. Though Mosaism recognises the distinction between mind and body, it considers man to be the union of the two. The body is the bearer of the spirit—the body, according to Mosaism, is elevated to such a position as alone fits it to be the vehicle of the

god-like, self-sanctifying spirit. Therefore anything that tends to corporeal degradation or depravity, or to give the body predominance over the mind, is opposed to Mosaism, because it disturbs the moral consciousness of man and subtracts from his holiness. Spiritual holiness is expressed in Mosaism, also by corporeal cleanliness and purity. Where any physical causes render the contrary unavoidable, it is to be succeeded by a purification partly real and partly symbolical. Sexual life giving a certain ascendency to the sensual portion of our nature, is subjected to fixed regulations and necessitates subsequent purification, as we before observed, when treating of the laws that refer to marriage.

Further, Mosaism restricts,* or wholly forbids, the

* Modern medical science confirms these hygeian principles of the code of Moses, and indicates them to be further evidence of his inspiration. As man advances to civilisation in all nations, he discovers the laws necessary to health, and as he so advances, an approximation, and only an approximation, to the hygiene octroyée of the Pentateuch is everywhere manifest. Ignorance of sanitary principles, even at this day generates too commonly a belief, that the Mosaic dietetic ordinances were induced by the climate of the East, and were not the inspiration of that divine wisdom which prompted his other utterances. While it must be at once admitted, that to the inhabitant of more temperate climates their infringement is less injurious, in them must yet be recognised, the universality of that law, divinely inspired for all ages, and for all countries inhabited by man. The general value of this physical code finds full confirmation in the works of many writers on medical science, especially in those of one who, by his professional brethren, is regarded as one of the most profoundly learned of modern pathologists. His kindness affords me the opportunity of citing his opinion succinctly stated (in a note which I textually quote) on the

'DIETETIC AND SANITARY CODE OF MOSES.

'Madam,—I have great pleasure in complying with your request, that I would furnish you with some references to my

employment as articles of food, of things calculated to vitiate that body, whose office is to be the vessel of the

work on practical medicine,* indicating my opinion as to th injurious influences of several articles of food which are forbidden to be used in the admirable institutions of your lawgiver Moses, and which are too generally employed in Christian and other countries. I have stated, in various parts of my work, that these kinds of food are the causes of several diseases, have enumerated the articles in question, in connection with the disorders of which they are often the exciting and concurring causes, and have remarked, that they are still more productive of disease in warm and inter-tropical countries. In the first volume of the work above-mentioned, at p. 566, I have, when treating of the numerous causes of disease, mentioned amongst others of those causes, the use as food of pork, and pork meats, of the blood and viscera of animals, and of shell-fish, as being not merely predisposing causes in many instances, but often also exciting or concurring agents.

'Under the heads, Dysentery (vol. i.p. 695) and Diarrhea, I have stated that in the east these diseases have been rendered almost epidemic by the use of the articles in question. The late Sir James Annesley mentioned to me that fresh pork was served out to a regiment in India, and that dysentery and diarrhea were the consequences in two-thirds of those who had partaken of it; these diseases subsiding after the cause was relinquished.

"In the several parts of my work where erysipelas and other diseases of the skin are treated of, the use of shell-fish has been assigned as one of the chief causes of these numerous and often dangerous forms of disease. When describing also the effects of various articles of animal food, which often become poisonous, owing either to their respective natures, or to diseases of which these articles may have been the seats, I have particularly indicated fresh pork and pork meats in any form, the viscera and blood of animals, and shell-fish (see vol. iii. 385—389). What I have stated respecting the nature and treatment of the poisonous effects of these substances is too detailed to admit of transcription, as it would fill many pages even of print. But I may quote the following passage:—'Fresh pork is often injurious, and gives rise to various symptoms according to the idiosyncrasy of the individual, and to the manner in which the animal has

^{*} A Dictionary of Practical Medicine, etc. By James Copland, M.D., F.R.S., etc.

god-like soul. The physical constitution is liable to be animalised by the inordinate enjoyment, not of vegetable but of animal diet. 1st. It is forbidden, that such parts of the bodies of animals as are especially imbued with the vital principle, such as the blood (by Scripture said to contain the life) should pass into the bodies of men, because they would render them too animal. 2ndly. It is enjoined that no animals be eaten which subsist on carrion or flesh, such as all beasts of prey. 3rdly. All such creatures as are imperfectly organised of their kind-(such as those that chew the cud, but do not part the hoof, or vice versa, and those fishes that have not both fins and scales): and 4thly, all animals in general that form the inferior orders of organised beings, such as insects, worms, and amphibia, are declared unfit for human food, in order to prevent the vitiation of the body by the

been fed. In the East, especially in warm climates, pork is often productive of diarrhea and dysentery, effects which I have seen caused by it in this country. The Mosaic law forbade the use of it; and there can be no doubt of the wisdom of this law, as respects warm countries, and I believe as regards all countries. (vol. iii. art. Poisons, p. 387). I afterwards go on to describe the symptoms and the treatment of the poisonous effects of pork.

'When treating of Scrofulous and Tubercular Maladies (vol. iii, p. 736), I have noticed the influence of the articles in question, in producing gout, and scrofulous and tubercular affections in the offspring of persons who use these articles.

'I have the honour to remain,

'Madam,

'Yours respectfully,
'JAMES COPLAND.'

5, Old Burlington Street.

By such of my brethren and sisters as desire not only to read and accept, but to comprehend, the code given by their Creator for the well-being physical, mental, and moral of His creatures, many portions of my learned correspondent's valuable work (particularly those referred to) will be found to be as useful to the general, as to the scientific reader.—A. M. G.

introduction into it of imperfectly organised matter. Assuredly all this is based on a profound knowledge of the laws of nature.

The same tendency prevails in the regulation of temporal as of sensual life. Mosaism estimates the professional and industrial life of man at its just value, and recognises it to be the vocation appointed to him by God. But it also duly perceives and appreciates the danger likely to result to men in their intellectual and spiritual life, from the exclusive devotion of the faculties of the spirit created in the image of God, to that professional or industrial calling.

It therefore provides specially for the periodical suspension of industrial exertions, fixed times, at which man shall wholly cease from his labour, and living the life of the spirit, devote himself to the advancement of his intellectual and religious being. To this end was the sabbath ordained, a Mosaic institution that has won the adherence of the whole civilised world.

"Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work, but thou shalt rest on the seventh day." The very spirit of Mosaism rendered the limitation of this institution to its outward form impossible, but imparted to it a definite relation to religion itself. Mosaism therefore combines it with the knowledge of God as the Creator and ruler of the Universe, thus making it the medium by which the idea and the acknowledgment of God are manifested, the basis of the whole of the Mosaic system. An intentional violation of the sabbath is a violation and abandonment of the whole of Mosaism. It was quite consistent with its design, that Mosaism should include, besides the sabbath, the appointment of certain times at which the religious dependence of man on

God, should be especially recalled to his consciousnes;—festivals of which the idea sprang partly from the nationality or history of the people of Israel, such as Passover and Tabernacles; partly from the operations and gifts of nature, such as the harvest festivals, Schevang and Tabernacles; and partly from the general spiritual requirements of mankind, as the day of Atonement, for which the day of the blowing of the trumpet or of memorial, was a preparation.

The Day of Atonement being of general importance for mankind, must detain us for a brief space. We have perceived that Mosaism pronounces sin to be the antagonism of holiness; that it considers it to be a disturbance of the due relation existing between the god-like soul and the Divinity, but that it declares it annulled by a return to holiness, as sinfulness is effaced by means of repentance, and through the mercy of God. Further, it is consistent with the design of Mosaism that this return and this consequent blotting out of sin, were not to be purely abstract, but that Mosaism sought to lead man to this course and to help him on his amended path. This was the indwelling thought of the Day of Atonement, a thought which has partially disseminated itself through human society. A recurrent period, at which this idea of the abandonment of sin, the return to God's ways by means of repentance and self-examination, should be permitted and brought specifically to the consciousness of man, was a want, a benefit, and a powerful aid to self-sanctification.

Mosaism formed a complete contrast to antiquity and the middle ages, in this great consistent and uniform system, social and moral. We perceive clearly that Mosaism propounded a system of ethics and of society wholly new, wholly different to any other produced by antiquity. The conditions of these differences are the following—Mosaism declares the attributes of the Supreme Being to be love, justice, and purity, while antiquity bases its most refined code of morals on egotism.

While the 'Beautiful and good' of Plato, the 'Middle Course' of Aristotle, the 'Abstinence' of the Cynic, the 'Pleasure' of the Epicurean, and the 'Indifference' to pain of the Stoic, are but variations of one and the same principle of egotism, Mosaism adopts personal freedom, equality of right and justice, and possible equality of possession, as the basis of its society. Antiquity, on the contrary, has, for the natural elements of its society, castes, the predominance of certain races, the freedom of certain races, and slavery. Like circumstances obtain in the feudal system of the middle ages. You must indeed, my hearers, have perceived that much which has been attained to in the most recent times, is declared in Mosaism; much more which Mosaism enforces, can be achieved only in ages yet to come.

All this Mosaism pronounced to be, thousands of years ago, not the consequence, but the basis, of the development of the human race.

LECTURE IV.

PROPHETISM.

Mosaism had furnished the doctrine of a unique, essentially one, supermundane, and holy God; of the world, as the work of God, which He causes to continue by means of the laws of nature; and of man as the unity of a spirit in the image of God, and the most highly organized body, to whom God stands in the immediate relation of Providence, Judge, the Fountain of atonement and of revelation. In a word, Mosaism had furnished the religious idea—and moreover the realization of the idea through the sanctification of man, manifesting itself in the individual, under the form of justice and mercy, of love to God and man; in society, in equality of rights, and all practicable equality of possession. This mosaic holiness demands further, the dominion of moral consciousness over the sensuous and the worldly; in one word it demands religious life.

The essential object of the following lectures, can only be, to shew in how far this doctrine took a firm root in mankind, and is progressively taking a still stronger hold; and lastly, what have been its peculiar effects within Judaism itself. For it must be remembered, that in man there exist instincts, directly opposed in their tendency, to these teachings. Man's natural standard being himself, his instincts are for the most part egotistical. According to that standard, he seeks to comprehend, to measure and to judge, God

and the universe. He must thus ever come to conclusions opposite to those produced by Mosaism, since God and the world merge into one, and since egotism and its coarse or more refined gratification, would appear to him to be the law of actual existence.

Nor should it be forgotten, that according to the teachings of Moses, man is unfettered—a free agent; and that the first condition of this free agency is the creation of the spirit of man in the image of God. That, therefore, the law could not consistently with its own teachings, in any way arrogate to itself, like a deus ex machina, the immediate subjugation of the spiritual world, but that it presupposed and set forth the gradual development of mankind. The principle of egotism, which is inherent in man, and antagonistic to the Mosaic doctrine, was allowed to develop and exhaust itself throughout antiquity, until mankind arrived at the conviction of the comfortlessness of this system; when at the fitting period Christianity and Islamism, emanating from Mosaism, were commissioned to propagate the Mosaic view. And to this subject we shall hereafter return.

All the history of man's spiritual development, when considered from two points of view, becomes clear and consistent with itself. The first point is the adoption by mankind of the religious idea as presented by Moses, on the one hand; and, on the other, the free development of mankind in general, and in them of the principles antagonistic to that idea.

The first condition was, that the religious idea should exist and be preserved, in a fit receptacle; and that at the due time it should issue forth, act upon, and influence the whole world of man. This receptacle was the Hebrew race. For the reception of the religious or Divine idea, as the reverse of the human idea, or Heathenism, no established people could be found, whose mental soil was ready tilled and prepared. For in all such human vessels, the seeds of its antagonistic principle—Idolatry, had been sown and had taken root. It was necessary, that in its national infancy, a race should be appointed and trained to this, their sacred mission; and that to be the depositaries, preservers, and disseminators of the religious idea, should be their whole vocation, their sole destiny, then and evermore.

The second condition was, that also in that infant race, some of these natural instincts and heathen principles should be inherent. That, consequently, the religious idea was to overcome the tendencies foreign to itself, in its depositaries, the Jewish race, in order to render them wholly devoted to their appointed vocation. Thus was this conflict of the religious idea with its opposite principle, to be fought to its close within the Jewish race; and the champion in this combat is Prophetism.

Permit me, my hearers, to define this proposition more closely.

In the wide circle of the family of man, every more highly endowed nation has its individual task to accomplish; each people has its peculiar mission—its special destiny, growing out of, and dependent on, its natural capacities, its inherited characteristics, modified or developed by the varying incidents of locality and climate, and by the course of external events. If this fact is everywhere observable even in the present time, notwithstanding the close and constant intercourse sub-

sisting between nation and nation; notwithstanding the almost immediate participation by one people in the new intellectual acquirements of another; if even in our day, the respective vocations of the English, French, German, North American, etc., admit at once of clear definition-how much more manifest must have been their several national characters, in more remote ages, when each people dwelt isolated; and when the specific individuality of each, being unacted upon from without, must have assumed and retained more marked and indelible forms? Thus the vocation of the Hebrew race was, to make the religious idea victorious within Judaism, over its antagonist the heathen idea; and subsequently to transplant that religious idea into the midst of the family of man, there to take root, and to extend its branches unto all. That such was its mission, we deduce from the fact that it has effected nought else, and that in it alone it has found being and consistence. All the writings-all the works of the Jewish mind, have a religious import and tendency. If in recent times the Israelites have tilled other fields of literature, we must not forget that these intellectual efforts have been made by them, not specifically, in their character as Jews, but because they, in their altered social condition, have availed themselves of the general extended cultivation of mankind.

In order to prepare fitting soil for the reception and propagation of the germ of the religious idea, it was necessary that Divine Providence should pre-ordain the training and development of the Jewish people for this, their mission. Such progressive training we clearly recognise in the patriarchal history of the Hebrew race; which, beginning with the man Abraham, grew from

him into the family of Jacob, and from them into the twelve tribes; and they, under the leadership of Moses became a distinct people. This history further relates, how Abraham was called to a distant and strange land; how Jacob, by reason of his many wanderings, became again a stranger in the land of his birth, and was transplanted with his family into a foreign country; and how, even in the midst thereof, his posterity found space to increase, so that they became an unmixed nation. How again this people was conducted to the peninsula of Sinai, in order that there, in those uninhabited regions, its natural tendencies of organization should be developed; and that as a nation, it should there receive the religious idea. Then, and then only, was it permitted to return to the land, in which, until the conflict within itself was fought out, it was destined to dwell. Thus this race was ever kept isolated, in order to preserve it from the contamination of heathenism, and to render it a fitting instrument for the dissemination of the religious idea. From that time forward, the Jewish race appeared on the great theatre of the world in its entire character; as a people carrying Mosaism in its heart and hand.

There can be no rational doubt respecting this; for wherever we may begin our examination, even in the later writings of the Hebrews, these point back to something previously existing, as the root from which they have sprung, and this is—Mosaism. Wherever in the history of the Jews we commence, it always exhibits a struggle for something already extant, and that is—Mosaism.

Hence, a marked peculiarity of the Jewish race also springs; one, indeed, which distinguishes it from all other peoples. This race, at its very birth, had its appointed mission given it; while other peoples, on the contrary, have progressively developed their missions, and come to the knowledge of what these missions are, when they are well-nigh fulfilled. Thus the Jewish race possesses a history from its very commencement; at a period when other nations have scarcely myths. That race knew from its origin what it was to perform, and why it existed. It knew itself from the earliest moment to be the people of God; that is, the depositary of the religious idea. It was not chance, however, that caused the Hebrew people to relapse again and again during its infancy, into heathenism. To generate idolatry, is inherent in man's nature, and the Israelites were men. Consequently, heathenism came into being, and shewed itself among them. It is true, that (their life being Mosaic,) they borrowed their heathenism from the surrounding nations. But had this not been at hand, they would, doubtlessly, have originated a heathenism of their own. This shews itself during the period even of their Mosaic development. Not the popular classes only, but likewise princes, kings and priests, re-introduced and promoted heathenism. Thus all preventive measures availed nothing; and Moses died in the full consciousness that his people were going forth to this battle.

While all the rest of mankind, therefore, pursued their unshackled course of development in the direction of the Human idea, it was reserved for the children of Israel, "the smallest of the peoples of the earth," to fight out within themselves the combat of the Religious idea. Though the generations of Moses and Joshua had, it is true, permitted Mosaism to take deep root

among the people; yet is it equally true that the first national period, the days of the Judges, was their real state of nature, in which antagonisms co-existed side by side, without coming into active collision. The masses yielded first to one impulse and then to another, and the people was still unconscious of its own unity. The influence and authority of each judge did not extend respectively, beyond one tribe or more.

It was necessary to fight, in self defence, against the hostile surrounding nations.* Mosaism as well as heathenism was the affair of the individual; a state of things graphically portrayed in the closing passage of the Book of Judges.† "In those days every man did that which was right in his own eyes." But the Judges in inciting and leading the people against the heathen nations, had ranged themselves on the side of Mosaism, and in its name and spirit were they compelled to appear in the field. And the last Judges, Eli and Samuel, being men of superior intellect, insisted on the ascendancy of Mosaism, and endeavoured to render it the inherent characteristic of their people.

By the adoption of the monarchical form of government, a decisive and critical step was taken. I do not mean that it was per se, an anti-mosaic institution, or that it carried with it into the Hebrew popular life a directly heathen element.‡ But the people became, by its means a unity, and received as a concrete body a temporal head, that exercised a preponderating sway over them; so that in the future it might depend on the personal bias of the king, whether Mosaism or heathenism should be the dominant principle of action in Israel.

^{*} Jud. 2. 11—19. † Ibid. 21—25. ‡ See Lecture III.

It was easy to foresee that kings, in the interest of their unfettered rule, would soon become prone to favour heathenism, and to supplant Mosaism. For the latter demands and ensures freedom and equality; securing to the people the superior influence in the state government. According to Mosaism, the king is only one taken from the midst of his brethren.'* Samuel, therefore, clearing foreseeing all these results, is opposed to the establishment of a monarchy, and seeks to impress upon the national mind, the theocratic idea; for the Bible tells us that God deputes Samuel to fulfil the desires of the people.+ In other words, by this state of vacillation between heathenism and Mosaism, nothing could be gained. It was absolutely necessary that the conflict between the two principles should be fought out to the last; and kingly rule furnished the most direct means to that end. Though, on the whole, the monarchical period was decidedly Mosaic in its bias and character, even the first king, Saul, betrayed much unsteadiness. This indecision was in itself a crime, and through it he fell. David was true to Mosaism; but he was a warrior, a conqueror; he was subjective, for egotism (though of a higher order perchance) was his incentive to action. He sought to identify Mosaism with his own and his family's sovereign rule. There lies deep meaning, therefore, in the prohibition pronounced against David's building a 'temple unto the Lord.' In it was heard the echo of Samuel's warning voice. With Solomon, heathenism ascended the throne of Israel. Solomon's ideal theory was doubtlessly Mosaic. He built the temple, and prayed there in all sincerity of heart; but his nature was heathen.

^{* 5} Mos. 17. 15.

tone of his philosophical estimate of life and of society. and his views of government, were all essentially heathen. His habits, manners, and morals, were therefore heathen. It was consequently an easy matter for him, in order to please his strange wives, to sanction the presence of heathenism, by the side of Mosaism. Thus, towards the close of Solomon's long reign, heathenism had again invaded Israel, and gained a party in the state. The national unity was destroyed, and that disunion, which for some time had existed internally, now manifested itself externally. The nation broke up into two kingdoms, hostile to each other. The very existence of the people was thus impaired, and their political downfall rendered inevitable. The only question then was, would Mosaism issue triumphantly from the ruin of the nation, or not?

Policy compelled the kings of the ten tribes of Israel, to establish and maintain heathenism as the state religion, in order to keep their subjects away from Jerusalem, and to alienate them from Judaism: since for them Mosaism and self-destruction would have been identical. In Judea, indeed, it was far otherwise. There stood the sanctuary consecrated to Mosaic worship. It would undoubtedly have been for the best and highest interests of the royal house of David, to have remained its faithful adherents. But the majority of these kings mistook their course, and favoured heathenism in order to render their personal authority absolute. They did not cause the Mosaic temple service to be actually discontinued, but they conferred equal rights on the heathen worship, the former being degraded to a matter of form, to a hypocritical act of material devotion.

But the more strenuous the opposition of the kings, the more determined became the adherence of the people to Mosaism. Not the masses of the people, but the men of the people, those who had appreciated and vindicated the popular interest, despite the kings; those who had recognised that Mosaism constituted the very vital principle of the Jewish race, and that consequently the Jewish people could not but forfeit its existence, sooner or later, whenever it should abandon Mosaism: those who had become convinced, that as in heathenism were involved the degradation and the servitude, so in Mosaism lay the exaltation and the freedom of the people; - these inspired and master-minds zealously sought to keep alive Mosaism, and by it, to counteract the undue influence exercised by the monarch over his subjects. The masses of the people watched this conflict in a state of perpetual fluctuation, and the prophet Elijah calls on them in these remarkable words, 'How long will ve halt between two opinions? Baal is God follow him, if the Lord is God, follow Him.'*

In the kingdom of Israel this struggle was speedily decided. Mosaism succumbed; heathenism encouraged by the sovereign, overcame the people, previously alienated from Mosaism. Their downfall was imminent. All trace of these ten tribes, with the exception of a few fragments that attached themselves to the kingdom of Judea, was irrecoverably lost. All search after them was and is vain, for they had been their own destroyers.

In the kingdom of Judah, events took the opposite course: Mosaism obtained the victory. But in what

^{* 1} Kings 18. 21.

manner was this effected? Not by the conquest of the heathen kings by the Mosaic people; for not the people, but the men of the people, were the combatants. The people, as a political body, were annihilated. From their ruins, ruins permeated with the very spirit of Mosaism, a new people arose, devoted from their cradle to Mosaism, and developing with their own growth, a new Jewish popular life. The kingdom was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, the people were carried away captive into Babylon; after some time the fragmentary tribes returned to Palestine, never more to relapse into heathenism, but faithfully to preserve the religious idea in the bosom of the Hebrew race. By means of the fall of the Jewish people, Mosaism triumphed, and by means of Mosaism, the Jewish race has been preserved.

Let us now endeavour to become better acquainted with the combat and the combatants. Contemporaneously with the establishment of the kingdom, a popular party had arisen in the state, whose aim was, to uphold Mosaism in the presence of monarchy. How was this popular party composed? We have stated above that it consisted, not of the masses of the population, but of men from among the people, men of the people, pleaders and defenders of the popular cause. Who then were these men? Moses had intended this vocation for the priests and Levites, as the organs of public worship, and as a body of national instructors. But the priests, attracted by the glare of the crown, soon became the mere tools of their sovereigns and princes. The priests, then, were not these men of the people. These men of the people were—the prophets. Who and what are the prophets? Let us examine into their history more closely.

Moses was the first אבי prophet, that is, he to whom first, from amidst all the people, a divine revelation was vouchsafed, on whom the 'Spirit of the Lord rested.' He promised the perpetuation of prophetism in Israel, the appearance of men, in whose mouth the 'Lord would put His words',* in order to secure to the divine or religious idea, the victory over the human idea or heathenism.

Although so early as the days of the Judges, Deborah† was designated a prophetess, and allusion besides made to a prophet whose name is not mentioned; the *virtual* father of the prophets (after Moses) was Samuel.

This grand, penetrating character was resolved to create, in opposition to the royal dignity, and for the protection of the religious idea, a second power in the state, a spiritual power, the power of the word, of conviction. He, therefore, established schools of prophets, and consequently a prophetic order, simultaneously with royalty. In these schools men were instructed in impassioned eloquence, consonant with the spirit of Mosaism; also in the art of sacred song, which excited them to sublime, prophetic oratory, and solemn poesy.

The disciples, termed Sons of the Prophets, lived in community,‡ in houses built by themselves—ate in common their frugal repasts—adopted a general costume,

^{*} Deut. 18. 15-18.

[†] Let those who ascribe to Judaism a tendency to degrade the social position,—the vocation of woman, remember, that in its society she was called to exercise the loftiest, the most ennobling function vouchsafed to a human being—that of prophecy. Let them also remember the inspired strains of a Deborah and a Miriam, as well as the fact that the prophetess Huldah‡ 'dwelt in the house of the prophets,' and that‡ 'the word of the Lord' was asked at her mouth by the sovereign. A. M. G.

^{‡ 2} Kings 22. 13—20. 2 Chron. 34. 22.

and fixed habits and manners—and had at their head a father of the prophets, as Elijah and Elisha are termed. Thus the order of the prophets as an institution, became the fountain whence the more highly-gifted and inspired seers drew the material resources for the achievement of their mission. We find, therefore, subsequently to the age of Samuel, frequent allusions made to numerous companies of prophets. When Jezebel sought to exterminate them, a certain Obadiah alone, found means to save one hundred; and soon after, mention is made, first of a party of one hundred, and then of fifty, while eight hundred and fifty prophets of Baal appear on the scene. By these means, a regular order of the prophets was founded; and this expanded into a class of popular orators. Two results thence ensued. On the one hand, all these Sons of the Prophets could not attain to that higher position, in which they might have achieved universal appreciation and influence. Prophetism in itself was not confined to the prophetic schools. (Amos).

From the collective body of these prophets we must accordingly select those, who thus highly endowed with the gifts of the soul and the intellect, stand forth the directly-chosen ones, filled and inspired with the 'Spirit of the Lord.'

On the other hand, that the ever-growing corruption should at length invade these prophet-ranks, and that the prevailing party should employ them as tools by which to delude the people, and alienate their allegiance from the true prophets, was wholly inevitable. Therefore in the latest centuries, a countless multitude of false prophets arise, against whom and their deceptions, the true prophets, such as Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah,

Ezekiel, spoke in words of flame, and never wearied of uttering warning denunciations. The false, were easily to be distinguished from the true prophets. The first were ever contented with existing circumstances, in accordance with the powers that were. They encouraged the moral and religious degeneracy of the people, fostered their depravity, and predicted to them power, duration, and victory. The true prophets held a diametrically opposite course. These prophets, having nought on their side save a weak, vacillating, and demoralized population, had to contend against the temporal sovereign, a debased and hypocritical priesthood, and against their perfidious colleagues, invested as these were, with like dignity with themselves. In this conflict they displayed a mental strength, a spirit of devotion, of resignation, of self-sacrifice and of fearlessness, which have been seldom reached, and never surpassed by man, and which well entitle some of them to be numbered among the noblest heroes of human kind. Hence the many traditions existing of the violent deaths of several of these prophets, which traditions are in some instances confirmed by history.

The means employed by these prophets were harangues, in which they addressed the people, and occasionally the monarchs, and in which, while referring to general or special circumstances, they strenuously urged on them, the adoration and worship of the Supreme and the obligations of morality. They condemned idolatry and immorality, and indicated the true course by which, both religiously and politically, the people could secure to themselves national duration and prosperity. They took their stations wherever the people were assembled; in the temple, the market-

place, and at the gates of the city. They spoke; and their bold and inspired flights of eloquence transported the audience, as it were, to other and higher spheres, to which the actual world around them presented so dire a contrast, and which nevertheless was to be the world of Israel's race. They often repaired to the palace of the king, often gathered around them the elders of the people, analyzed their crimes, and depicted to them the future that awaited them, with unsparing energy. Sometimes also they reduced their speeches to writing, and spread them abroad, and tried to extend their influence by causing them to be read and copied. In short, they sought and employed every means by which to act beneficially on their brethren.

While the prophets, as a body, are thus presented to us, as exerting so powerful an influence on the political condition of their countrymen, they divide themselves into two classes, the one consisting of those, of whose career history alone informs us; the other of those whose prophetic writings (containing a portion of their spoken addresses), have descended to us. The most distinguished among the first-named, are Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha. The second class* is composed of

* Science has now irrevocably determined that all the chapters of Isaiah from the 40th to the 66th are the work of another prophet, who lived towards the end of the Babylonian captivity. The order in which the sacred writings have come down to us, gives proof of this, otherwise the historical appendix of the book of Isaiah would have been placed not from the 36th to the 39th chapters, but after the 66th chapter.

As frequent mention will be made in the course of these lectures of a 'first' Isaiah and a 'second' Isaiah, it may be well here to furnish a statement of what is advanced by the advocates of the theory, viz: that the book of Isaiah is the work of two separate authors who flourished in different ages, as well as the

the four major and twelve minor prophets, thus distinguished in reference only, to the comparative extent of their writings. Samuel, the *second* founder of Mosaism in Israel, must have plainly foreseen, as

answers put forth, and, as the writer ventures to think, successfully, in refutation of that theory.

Towards the close of the last century, Koppe was the first biblical critic to cast doubts on the authenticity of that part of Isaiah which extends from the 40th chapter to the close of the book. His views were afterwards adopted by a multitude of writers, such as Döderlein, Juste, Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Paulus, Bauer, Bertholdt, De Wette, and Gesenius, the last mentioned of whom may be regarded as the most authoritative exponent of the negative system. Among the Jews the book was received entire, and no doubt was ever entertained by them of the authenticity of any part. It is recorded in the Talmud (Baba Bathra) that the associates of King Hezekiah collected the prophecies of Isaiah; and in the preface to Isaiah, in what is called 'Mendelssohn's Bible,' there is a quotation from 'Medrash Rabba,' shewing that the father of Hosea left two prophecies which have been incorporated with the writings of Isaiah. Again, Spinoza (Tract. Polit. Theol.) casts a suspicion on the completeness of the prophecies of Isaiah, as we now possess them. But all these doubts are very different from the results aimed at by the modern critics of Germany. De Wette, in his Introduction to the Scriptures (German 5th Edition, section 208), has collected all the reasons advanced by the German critics in support of their theory; but a much fuller account is given in Francis Maurer's Latin Commentary on Isaiah (Leipsic, 1836), chap. 40; and of which the substance is as follows:-The last twenty-six chapters are the work of some unknown prophet who lived about the close of the Babylonian captivity. This portion of the book contains discourses written by different men, but worked up into one book by one hand, as is proved by the uniformity of style. The time at which the author, or rather the editor lived, is inferred from the following

1. The Jews are represented as lying under the displeasure of God, and in the power of their enemies, who are subjecting them to harsh treatment (xlii. 22, 24; lii. 2, 3, 5): their land is desolate, their temple overthrown, and their city destroyed (xliv. 26, 28;

did Moses, the grand struggle into which his people were about inevitably to be drawn. He conceived the idea of a theocratic republic* within Mosaism. The succeeding prophets modified this conception. With

li. 3; lii. 9; lviii. 12; lxii. 4; lxiv. 9-11); all their sacred institutions have passed away except the Sabbaths and the Fasts (lvi. 2; lviii. 2): but very shortly relief is to come to them (xl. 1, 2): and their former state is to be restored (xliv. 28; lviii. 12; lx. 10; lxi. 4). The kingdom of the Chaldees greatly flourishes (xlvii. 7.8.), but it is hastening towards the heavy judgments to be inflicted upon it by God through the hand of His servant Cyrus (xli. 2; xlv. 1-4), who, after he has conquered Babylon, will allow the Jews to return and restore their commonwealth (xliv. 28). All these things the author views as immediately before him, not like a prophet divinely instructed of things future as though they were present, but as one who lives and moves in the circle of these events. In proportion as the exactness of the prophet's statements in reference to the period that intervenes from the destruction of the Temple to the elevation of Cyrus agree with historical facts, so is the vagueness with which all these promises of the glorious restoration are intimated: they by no means agree historically with the description of those times, as furnished by Ezra, Nehemiah. Zachariah, Haggai, and Malachi. How did it happen that a writer who could foresee so plainly the ruin of Babylon, and the return of the Jews to Palestine, before the event, should be prevented from looking a little farther with the same steadiness of vision? Simply because he was contemporaneous with the decay of the Babylonian state, of which one of the natural consequences would be the emancipation of the Jews. * * * Moreover, the author appeals to ancient prophecies, already fulfilled, relating to the return from captivity; and to these he now adds some new ones (xlii.9; xlv. 19, 21; xlvi. 10; xlviii. 16).

2. The many peculiarities of the real Isaiah's style do not appear in the writings of the imitator. The only expressions common to both are קרוש ישראל and הַּבָּרֵא for הַיָּה in this there

^{*} Would not the realization of the enactments municipal and governmental laid down by Moses have, in fact, formed this theocratic republic? A. M. G.

them, it became a theocratic monarchy. Neither of these designs was realized. What Samuel did achieve for his brethren was, that for the vacillating Saul, he substituted as heir to the throne, the faithful follower of Mosaism, David.

is nothing surprising, if it be admitted that the later writer had diligently studied the writings of his predecessor. There are, however, many peculiarities belonging to the second part: as

אנאלתי	an Ar	amaic	form	for	הָנָאֵלְהִי	(lxiii. 6)
מאותי	'39	22	22			(liv. 15)
אותם	2)		- 23		אָהָם	(lix. 21)
	an Ara		40			(xliv. 19)
לַ יָּנַתר 'to	prove'	or 'to	try' ar	Ara	maism (dviii. 10)
A) חַפֵּץ	thing'	also an	Arama	aism	((xliv. 28.)

and many more.

3. Had this latter part of Isaiah existed before the destruction of Jerusalem, Jeremiah, who incurred great odium, and had to bear the most severe treatment for prophesying these melancholy events, would have readily appealed to the clear prediction of the same catastrophe, and of its happy termination, by so renowned a prophet as Isaiah.

The foregoing objections to the genuineness of the latter part of the book of Isaiah have been met by Hensler, Jahn, Brentano, Hengstenberg, Möller, and others. In reference to the above

points, they argue thus :-

1. None but the old prophet Isaiah, and not one living near the period of the return from Babylon, could say (xlviii. 7, 8), that no one before him had predicted the ruin of Babylon, since it is spoken of at considerable length by Jeremiah in the 50th and 51st chapters of his book. No prophet living at Babylon could possibly omit the Chaldeans from the catalogue of Israel's oppressors (lii. 4.5); but the prophet Isaiah could do so, as he lived and wrote a considerable period anterior to the Babylonian captivity. Again, a writer of the age attributed to the second Isaiah could have had no conceivable motive for charging the Jews with idolatry, and even with sacrificing their children (lvii. 1, 4-13), as, it is generally admitted, that these sins were not committed by them in their exile. Besides which, the cities of Judah and Jerusalem itself are addressed by the prophet in the 40th chapter, 9th verse. This could of course be done by

We have observed above, that Mosaism having no external support in the kingdom of the ten tribes, its struggle with Heathenism was there much more feeble in its character. The principal combatants were Elijah and Elisha. Among the prophetic writers, Hosea and Amos only, worked in the kingdom of Israel; the former two against the hostile royal family of Achab—the two latter against that of Jehu. Elijah is the unsurpassed, the fiery adversary of Heathenism. His whole soul is fire; his whole being fire. But he bears

the real Isaiah, but assuredly not by the later author, if he be supposed to have lived when Jerusalem was destroyed, and the cities of Judah were laid waste.

2. The language in the second part of Isaiah is as elegant as in the first part, and in some instances even more so. The few minor differences in point of style are readily accounted for by the difference in Isaiah's age at the respective dates when the two were composed. The Aramaisms offer no difficulty at all, since for a long period the Aramaic language had been known to the Hebrews; and a striking instance of this is evident in the first part of Isaiah (xxxvi. 11).

3. In the 44th chapter, 27th verse, there is a direct announcement of the manner in which Babylon should be captured, viz., by the diverting of the course of the Euphrates, and Herodotus relates (i. 185, 190), that this was historically fulfilled. Now if the author lived *before* the taking of Babylon, as the critics admit, this properly must be held to be as sure a proof of his inspiration as any that could possibly be required.

4. The name of Cyrus which occurs in Isaiah (xliv. 28, and xlv. 1) is generally regarded as an evidence against the authenticity of the book; because, it is contended, prophets do not predict proper names, nor do they enter into details. But who is to prescribe to a prophet what he is to reveal? Besides which, the name of *Koresh* is not a proper name, but the common term for *King* in the ancient Persian language (Jahn, Introduction).

[To the kindness of the Rev. D. W. Marks, I am indebted for the above lucid statement of the arguments employed by those who support, and by those who deny the theory, that the book of Isaiah is the work of two authors.—A. M. G.]

within him the full consciousness, that this fire—pure and holy as it is—consumes him in vain; and that this is the will of the Lord,* who dwells in the still small voice. This fire could not alter the course of events on earth, and therefore causes him to ascend to heaven. Elisha, his disciple and successor, no longer seeks to stem the torrent; he collects around him whom he can, and guides and sustains as many as he can.

Matters are otherwise in the kingdom of Judah. There the Prophet's conflict does not cease. The nearer the kingdom approaches to its fall, the hotter becomes the fight. It holds on, even when the Chaldeans had fired the walls of Jerusalem. It takes its stand on the smouldering ashes of the ruined city. It flies for refuge with its champions into Egypt, and is transported with the sons of the captivity to Babylon. It seeks even there, to restore the spiritual stronghold; † it gathers together the remnant still faithful to Mosaism, from amidst the collected ruins of the population; it reconducts them to the Holy Land. And it ceases only after the erection of the Second Temple, when the destined task of Prophetism had been accomplished—to fix immoveably and for ever, the Religious Idea in the mental being of the Jewish people. The foremost combatants in this battle were Isaiah and Jeremiah, in Jerusalem; Ezekiel and the second Isaiah, t in Babylon; Haggai and Zechariah, during the building of the second temple; Malachi, at the period of national regeneration of the people of Israel.

Of all the prophetic writers, Isaiah is indisputably the one whose style is the most lofty, nervous, and sublime. His utterances are replete with striking

metaphors, strong antitheses, and graphic paronomasia. He pours forth a gushing tide of inspired eloquence, breathing* earnest morality, deep faith in the good, glowing enthusiasm for the God-like, unshaken fidelity to the Deity, and burning indignation against apostasy, pride and unrighteousness. Isaiah, as he is doubtlessly the grandest, was also the most favoured of the prophets. He lived at a period when it still appeared possible, that by means of a passing chastisement, the purification, regeneration, and deliverance of the people might be effected. He not only survived two periods of general alarm that were happily overcome by Judah -the first, that of the war carried on successfully by the Syrian monarch in alliance with Israel, against the kingdom of Judah, until he was vanquished by the king of Assyria; the second, when the latter, Sennacherib, turned his great armies against Judah, and when his career of victory was arrested by the sudden visitation of a desolating pestilence, that annihilated his hosts at the very gates of Jerusalem. But after the death of the thoroughly heathen king Ahaz, who had, by sacrificing to Moloch, polluted the sanctuary itself, and who contemptuously repelled the prophet, Isaiah still lived to witness the accession of the pious Hezekiah. This king restored Mosaism, and re-established the Mosaic temple-worship in its pristine splendour; reverentially listened to the admonitions of the prophet, and, by following his counsel, steadfastly and successfully withstood the might of Assyria.

Jeremiah experienced a totally opposite destiny. His

^{*} Characteristics which are equally those of the latter portion of this prophet's writings, termed by our author the second Isaiah.—A. M. G.

personal qualities were the loftiest, as his career was the most adverse and calamitous. In his youth, and in the earliest years of his public activity, he was the cotemporary of King Josiah, through whose instrumentality Mosaism, for the last time, exercised a brief sway in Israel. It shone with but meteoric light. After the death of this king, in the battle of Megiddo, the Egyptian party hostile to Mosaism became, at the accession of Jehoiakim, dominant in the state. At this juncture, the king of Babylon appeared as victor on the battle-field. But the arrogance of the Jewish monarchs led them obstinately to choose, and treacherously to pursue, their alliance with Egypt, and to join in a conspiracy against Babylon. The fall of Judah was easily to be foreseen. Jeremiah predicted the coming destruction, sometimes in gushes of fervid eloquence, sometimes in striking parables. But his warning voice was raised in vain, and his only reward was the infliction of stripes. Again the prophet boldly enters the palace of the king, and rebukes him for his injustice and covetousness. Boldly he presents himself before the priests, who seek to take his life, and succeed in banishing him from the 'Temple of the Lord.' Then he causes his addresses to be read to the king, in whose presence the roll is cut in pieces and burnt. He finds it necessary therefore, to remain in concealment. The succeeding king, Zedekiah, a weak sovereign, sought the prophet's counsel in many secret interviews, and would willingly have obeyed his admonitions. But the Egyptian party was all-powerful and overcame al, opponents by force. The Chaldeans surrounded Jerusalem-Jeremiah again urged the inhabitants to surrender, by which the city might have been saved; but

the prophet was maltreated and imprisoned.* In the midst of his prison, he, a captive, within a captive city, prophesies the overthrow and the subsequent restoration of Judah. For this the princes threw him into a miry pit,† where he was like to die. The king secretly causes him to be drawn up with cords. The city is taken, and the prophet liberated by Nebuchadnezzar, by whom the choice of his place of abode is given him. He desires to remain in Judea with the poorer portion of the inhabitants, who had not been carried away captive into Babylon.

A body of these, however, who refused to listen to his voice, fly into Egypt, whither they drag him with them. There they make him an eye-witness of their idolatrous practices, and disregard his words of warning and menace. Still he desists not .- As he had sat on the ruins of Jerusalem, so he sat mentally on the ruins of Babylon, his spirit soaring above them and beholding that resuscitated Judah which was to rise out of Babylon's ashes. This was his dying strain—the song of the swan. While Jeremiah thus witnessed and shared the suffering and misery attendant on the overthrow of his people, Ezekiel had been carried away captive to Babylon, eleven years previous to the taking of Jerusalem, and there inhabited a remote city. To preserve his fellow-exiles from the contamination of Babylonian idolatry, and to keep alive their attachment to Mosaism in the spirit, were thus the only objects, to which the solitary prophet could devote his energy. Ezekiel's mission, therefore, was to account for the fresh events step by step, shewing that they were the consequence of the abandonment of Mosaism in doctrine and

^{*} Jer. 37, 16,

in practice; that still, the fall of the religious idea was not identical with the fall of Judah; that, on the contrary, the faithful and the penitent portion of Israel, might confidently look forward to a restoration. Thus he was impelled to go over the whole of the Mosaic work, in his own manner and from his own point of view; and consequently he laid down, on one hand, a theory of the creation, on the other, in a magnificent vision, a plan for a new constitution of the future Israelite state, in which the Mosaic ideas were to be realised, though through modified ordinances.

As Ezekiel belongs to the earlier, the second Isaiah* belongs to the later period of the Babylonian captivity. While Cyrus, king of Persia, was hurrying on in a career of victory closed by his conquest of Babylon, the prophet arose, and declared this triumph of the Persian monarch to be the condition of Israel's predicted deliverance. When Babylon fell, his appeals awakened in the faithful few, the desire to return to their native land. When Cyrus had granted their request, and yet the sympathy evinced was but lukewarm, Isaiah speaks again and seeks to fan the zeal of the faithful into flame; and by warnings addressed to those, who forgot alike Zion and their God, to increase the number of the band of pilgrims. This second Isaiah is the one among the prophets, who clothes the strongest emotion in the loftiest and fullest streams of eloquence. His addresses are replete with brilliant imagery—with strains now of impassioned joy, now of deep pathos. If the other prophets depict to our mental vision the

^{*} Here it may be permitted to ask, where, in the records of that era, the propounders of the Second-Isaiah theory, find traces of his having lived and worked?—A. M. G.

fall of the mighty, he shews us how those who fail are upheld and raised again.* We shall elsewhere resume the thread of our narrative, relating the efforts made by Haggai and Zechariah to promote the rebuilding of the temple; and by Malachi to remove unmosaic elements from out of the peoples' life.

I have thus, respected friends, endeavoured to place clearly before you the outward plan of the development of the religious idea in the Jewish people, and also in prophetism, externally considered. It has been shown that the religious idea had first to overcome heathenism in its recipients; that this was to be effected only by means of a long struggle, in which prophetism furnished the weapons; that the national independence of the Jewish people was necessarily sacrificed to this object, in order that out of its ruins, new and devoted adherents should arise, by whose instrumentality, the religious idea should carry on the conflict with the whole world of man. It was the self-conquest of the Jewish race that obtained the victory. This self-conquest was undertaken with entire self-consciousness. For the prophets declare at all times, though with deep

* I would also be speak attention to a fact which in itself may be deemed evidence conclusive and incontrovertible, that the book called 'Isaiah,' is the utterance of one and the same prophetic and master spirit. That fact is the total absence, from the books and records written at the time of the captivity and the restoration, of all mention of the name, of all trace of the influence and efforts, of the prophet designated by German rationalists, the second Isaiah.

It seems almost superfluous to ask, whether it is possible such a spirit should have lived at such a time, without having marked his age by his deeds; without having summoned his brethren around him, to listen to the outpourings of living words, which, as written utterances even, have won, for him the title of 'the Sublimest of the seers of old!—A. M. G.

sorrow, that it must be unflinchingly achieved: that the people must fall, in order that from their ashes the religious idea, phœnix-like, should arise.

The argument of the whole of this first period, is consequently the subjugation of heathenism, within the Jewish people, by the religious idea—and the prophets are the instruments of the conflict and of the triumph.

The position and the task of prophetism has thus been recognised; its true signification now remains to be considered.

LECTURE V.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE PROPHETS AND THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

Among the many peculiarities which distinguish the history of the Jewish race from that of all other peoples, (which peculiarities in truth resulted from the idiosyncrasy of the national existence) we may adduce as one perhaps of the most remarkable, the fact, that the genius of this people took its boldest flights, and produced its loftiest creations, at a period of national decline, when the people themselves, fast sinking into moral and religious degradation, had well nigh abandoned their sublime mission. The greatest productions of other nations, have been coeval with their attainment of the zenith of their glory, and the noon of their national existence. Not so with the race of Israel. The lower it fell, the higher soared the latent national genius. This phenomenon, recurring again and again in their history, is not only easy of explanation, but is necessary to this people, since the spiritual essence of the Jewish race, is the eternal never-dying 'Religious Idea,' which, just when the disorganization of its appointed material vessel is apparently impending, must manifest itself with redoubled activity by individual effort, and thus render itself superior to the mutability of all earthly things. Then the prophets arise at a period when Heathenism sits on the throne of Israel, when it had obtained general sway over the people, had insinuated itself into the popular life, and

had thus paved the way to its natural consequence—the overthrow of the people of Israel. For the nation had not only lost that which constituted its true power and strength, that by means of which it had been enabled to stand in array against a world—the Religious Idea; but had likewise become enervated by Heathenism, in whose train had followed luxury, debauchery, immorality, injustice, oppression, and violence. The prophets repeatedly paint this condition of things in terms of unmitigated disgust and aversion.

Thus had the life of the Jewish people become wholly opposed in its character to Judaism. The only fragments of Judaism then still remembered and practised, viz., the sacrificial service and some few ordinances of the law, had degenerated into mere formal and insignificant observances. The prophets deemed it vain, amid this un-Mosaic life, this wholesale infringement of Judaism, to enforce the Mosaic law. In the first place, they could not have overcome the obstacles which the actual life of the people presented, inasmuch as the idea was wholly lost among them; in the second, the prophets could not fail to perceive that, even in the event of the people's acceptance of a portion of the Mosaic code, that portion would have been but empty ceremonial, since the idea no longer existed in the national mind.

The prophets, therefore, recognized the necessity of even combating so much of the practice of the Mosaic law as had survived, it being opposed to the idea, since it consisted of empty rites, involving mockery and hypocrisy. And this course they, in fact, adopted. Isaiah exclaims in the name of God: 'Of what avail to me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith the

Lord. I am cloyed with the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts, and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me: the new moons and sabbaths, the assembly proclaimed, I cannot support. What! Impiety blended with a solemn rite? Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth.'* Jeremiah even declares the sacrificial worship to form no integral part of Mosaism.†

Thet second Isaiah says: 'Is it such a fast that I have chosen a day for a man to afflict his soul? Is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and sit upon sackcloth and ashes? Wilt thou call this a fast and an acceptable day to the Lord? Is not this the fast that I have chosen—to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out of thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh.' The Jewish people having thus lost the Mosaic Idea and adopted Heathenism, it necessarily ensued that the life became un-Mosaic, and that what remained in it of Mosaism, had degenerated into empty form. It was, consequently indispensable, that the prophets should strive above all things to reinstate the religious idea among the people, in order that their life, which had in fact, wholly severed itself from that idea, might again be

made to accord with it. This severance rendered it imperative on the prophets, to seek to save the idea, and to imbue with it the heart of the people; and this compelled them to seize upon the religious idea only to aim to develop it and re-establish its sway. But it again thence resulted, that the idea was more generalized, and assumed an appearance of being opposed to, and independent of, material life. While in Mosaism the idea and the life are one and the same, the idea now appeared as self-existent, and severed from the life.*

This separation between the life and the idea was, doubtless, essentially un-Mosaic. It was likewise a great evil; for the union of the idea and the life, alone forms religious truth. It was, nevertheless, a condition of its development, and was in so far necessary; as by its means only, could be effected the dissemination of the religious idea throughout the whole world of man. The idea solely, could win mankind to itself. When, in the due course of its development, it shall have thoroughly permeated the mental being of man, it

^{*} For example: Mosaism had said, 'Love thy neighbour as thyself; consider thy neighbour's rights to be as thine own: every man shall be free; thou shalt not have thy neighbour for a slave, therefore give him his freedom in the seventh year, and let him go free, and furnish him liberally from thy corn, thy herds, and thy wine.' The people had lost this idea of personal freedom on their return to Heathenism, which brought with it castes-slavery: so they did not liberate slaves, nor observe the year of release. The prophets could not, therefore, insist on the observance of the year of release, but were obliged to enforce in general terms, the principle of the equality of rights among mankind, without expressly applying it to actual life. It would have been fruitless to address the people thus: 'The gleanings of the field belong to the poor; the second tithe of the third and sixth year.' So they gave general exhortation, 'Break thy bread,' etc.

will and must come into active existence, and regulate and mould material life.

We shall thus perceive, that the severance of the idea and the life is complete in Christianity; that in the middle ages, the idea was powerless in respect of the life; and that it is but in the most recent times, that it is again beginning to exert any influence on daily existence.

What we here deduce from history, at the close of a period of development of two thousand, five hundred years' duration, the prophets clearly foresaw and unequivocally predicted, at its commencement. Mosaism presents the union of the life and the idea, and could in the first instance be addressed to the Jewish race only. To disseminate the religious idea is Israel's mission; to live out the religious life, is Israel's appointed task. But the prophets, inasmuch as they especially set forth the religious idea—inasmuch as they elaborate it in its universality, and omit to insist on its special application, have the pre-consciousness that the religious idea is not Israel's portion only, but that of all mankind.* The acknowledgment of one God in His entire unity-of one God, supreme and holy, who is, in this indirect relation to man created in his image-Man's Providence, the sole source of judgment and revelation—the diffusion of universal love, by means of universal justice, freedom, and peace—and the universal acceptance of these by mankind, who will thereby be united and wholly influenced; -such are the chief points of development, which the prophets imparted to the Mosaic idea.

Each of these prophets, from the first to the last,

^{*} Moses, the first of the prophets, also declares this great truth again and again.—Deut. 4. 6; Judges 32. 1.—A. M. G.

inculcates this doctrine; and from each in succession, it receives additional development. Nay: this doctrine is even anterior to the prophets whose writings we now possess, and is in fact the very mother of prophecy. It is, viz., worthy of all remark, that, in Micah iv. 1-4, and in Isaiah, at the opening of a prophetic address, ii. 2-4, we find exactly parallel passages expressing this idea, with but this difference—that in Micah, the composition is more careful, and that there is one additional and very beautiful verse. There has been much controversy as to the original authorship of these verses. Closer investigation proves, however, that to neither of these two writers does it belong; but that they are but the transcript of an older prophetic declaration which both prophets cite,* and place, for a specific object, at the head of their respective paragraphs. The verses run thus:-" But in the last days, it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountain; and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it. And many nations shall come and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob. He will teach us of His ways, and we shall walk in His paths; for the law shall go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem; and He shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off: and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall

^{*} It is well known, that the prophets contain numerous quotations, the names of the writers of which are frequently not given.

they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his own vine, and his own fig tree, and none shall make them afraid; for the mouth of the Lord of Hosts hath spoken it."

It is herein declared—1st. That all nations of the earth will acknowledge the truth of the Religious idea. 2ndly. That they will consider themselves bound by it; and 3rdly. Peace, the cessation of war and strife, general security and happiness will, by means of that religious idea, come universally to prevail. We see this general acceptance of the religious idea metaphorically portrayed in "the going up of the nations to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob;" its fulfilment in the life, in "the walking in his paths;" its result, in the cessation of war, and in dwelling peacefully every one "under his own vine and his own fig-tree." Every prophet depicts, in accordance with his own character and in his own individual style, this great future of the human race, in the most vivid colours, and at length transfers into the brute creation, and into all nature, the spirit of heavenly peace.* "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed their young ones, shall lie down together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

^{*} Isaiah 11. 6-9.

As soon as the prophets had attained to the consciousness that Mosaism was not destined to limit its influence to the Jewish race, but that its ultimate end was the dissemination of the religious idea among the whole of mankind, the question-How was that design to be accomplished? naturally suggested itself to them. Their first necessary deduction was, that Israel was but the instrument of God.* To be the depositaries of the religious idea, for the whole human race, they recognised to be the mission of the whole posterity of Abraham.+ Their second deduction was, that in its fulfilment no thought of victory by force of arms, or by coercive means, or by the exercise of political power, was to be entertained. The idea could only prevail by virtue of its power as an idea; freedom cannot be attained through slavery; it can be won by free development alone. The views set forth in the writings of the prophets may be summed up as follows:—Israel is contaminated—God's chastisement is therefore necessary. By this chastisement Israel shall be sanctified and purified. Israel will be re-established. This chastisement, regeneration, and restoration will serve as examples and proofs of the truth of the religious idea ever existent in Israel, and therefore lead to its recognition by all people. There-

^{• &#}x27;And now saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again unto him,' etc.—Isaiah 49. 1.

^{† &#}x27;Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth. I have put my spirit upon him. He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax he shall not quench. He shall bring forth judgment unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth. And the isles shall wait for his law.'—Isaiah 42. 1—4.

fore Israel endures his punishment for the sake of all nations, his degradation and their contumely, for that of all mankind. Israel is the martyr for the human race, of the religious idea, as Isaiah in the well-known 33rd chapter represents him to be. The reference which these successive propositions bear to the actual condition of the Jewish people, (the latter furnishing in fact their connecting links) is clearly perceptible. The more palpable this condition of things became, as the fall of the kingdom approached and the captivity of the Jews ensued, and as their restoration appeared more imminent, the clearer were the predictions of prophecy. We shall, therefore, not be surprised to find, that the second Isaiah * puts forth these statements with the greatest precision.

The third deduction from the same view, is the amplification by the Prophets of the doctrine of the divine government of the universe, and of God's appearing to them, for the express purpose of leading, by means of justice and truth, all mankind to moral perfection; they declare that God ordains the destinies of all nations, in accordance with His universal wisdom. It is God who calleth upon people and princest for specific objects, who granteth them the victory, in order to chastise the iniquity of the conquered, and to humble the pride of man; but who prepareth likewise the downfall of the conqueror, if he misuse the success vouchsafed unto him.

The judgments of God, the purification of man by their means, and the re-acceptance of the purified man, are thus the chief subject-matter of the writings

^{*} Vide ante note, p. 93.

[†] Nebuchadnezzar, as likewise Cyrus, are "called of the Lord."

of the prophets; the theme of which they treat in endless modifications. With unflinching courage do they inveigh against all immorality; they denounce it in all its forms and phases; and brand its votaries, whether found among the people, the priests, or the princes, whether Israelite, Assyrian, Egyptian, Babylonian, or Tyrian. With unwearied hand do they portray their fall, their utter destruction. Then they turn to paint in glowing colours, how God is found of them who seek Him, how He hath compassion on the penitent, and blotteth out his transgression. But with deepest inspiration do they address themselves to the oppressed and downcast, and declare how the Lord, throned in unspeakable majesty, is nighest unto the broken in heart, and turneth his sorrow into joy, his aspirations into fulfilment; and is his Saviour and Redeemer.

What renders the Prophets so valuable is, that while Mosaism inculcates the right in fixed doctrine and specific rules of life, the Prophets bring general morality to be accepted, set it forth as the universal guide of human action, and insist upon the truth, that by means of it alone, can nations continue to exist, and that without it they must eventually decline and fall; that neither force of arms, nor diplomacy, is of power to sustain them, if morality has ceased to be active in the midst of them. The Prophets are the book of the peoples; the mirror in which they may see their destinies clearly reflected.

If we hastily review the utterances of each prophet individually, we shall perceive that Isaiah especially enlarges on the Holiness of the Deity. At his sanctification for his prophetic mission, the loftiest accent that greets his ear, is the three times "Holy,"* from the

lips of the scraphim. "Holy Lord" is the epithet, with which he most frequently apostrophises his God. This Holy God is sanctified by justice; he who accepts His judgments, sanctifies Him. Hence the Almighty's displeasure at crime and injustice, His condemnation of fraud and hypocrisy. Therefore He executeth judgment, causeth the proud to fall, and visiteth the froward, but purifieth by chastisement. *"When Thy law came to earth, the inhabitants of the world learnt righteousness." If He be angry, he returneth from His anger, and hath compassion, and guilt is expiated. Isaiah says, †"God teareth asunder the veil that hideth the nations; raiseth the covering that covereth all peoples; annihilateth death, and wipeth the tear from every eye."

The characteristic of Ezekiel is his enforcement of the doctrine of God's unconditional justice. The judgment of God is pronounced on all souls. ‡ Each soul will be judged individually; the sinful soul will be visited with death, i. e., annihilation; the just with life, i. e. salvation. If the just soul depart from justice, and turn to evil, it will be punished. If the wicked turn from transgression and pursue the path of right-eousness, it will receive forgiveness, and attain to immortality. God is therefore prompt to forgive; hath pleasure in the return of the repentant sinner. As with individual so it is with national existence.

But the second Isaiah is peculiarly the prophet of the unfortunate, of the oppressed and sorrowing. In every accent of tender love, he calls them to God, §He will feed his flock like a shepherd; He will gather

^{*} Isaiah 11. 9. † Isaiah 25. 7, 8.

[‡] So also Moses. — 5 Mos. 24. 16.; again, ibid, 30. 6, 15, 19.—A. M. G.

[§] Isaiah 40. 11.

the lambs with His arm and carry them in His bosom; *He giveth power to the faint; and to them who have no might He increaseth strength. He says † "Ho every one that thirsteth, come to the waters; and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat: yea, buy wine and milk without money and without price." He considers it his especial vocation to preach good tidings unto the meek. ‡ "He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound."

The thought of most frequent recurrence to him is, § "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne and the earth my footstool, but to that man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word." But all the glory of the earth is as nought in His sight, for || "Behold the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance."

The transition hence to the so-called Hagiographa, is easily perceived. They form the third division of the Old Testament, and a specific and necessary phase of the development of the religious Idea. We select for examination the Psalms, the Book of Job, and the Proverbs of Solomon. Doubtless a part of these writings preceded the prophets whose works we possess. Some of the Psalms were composed by David and his contemporaries; of many of the Proverbs, Solomon is the author; and, according to my view, (founded upon the style and the description of manners it contains), the Book of Job dates from the times of the Judges. These productions are, for the most part, unconnected with the march of events historically considered, and

^{*} Isaiah 40. 29. + 55. 1. ‡ 61. 1. § 66. 1, 2. || 40. 15.

appertain to the individual. But we must recollect also, that the individual lives amid, and is influenced by, the circumstances of his age and its prevailing mental tendencies, and that the mass is but composed of the aggregate of individual existences.

The characteristic of these writings, and one which renders them an integral and essential portion of the whole edifice of the religious Idea, is that they express subjective religion, i.e., the religion and piety of the individual. Mosaism and Prophetism declare the objective doctrines of God, the world, and mankind. The Hagiographa enlarge on the relation of God to the individual, and of the individual to his God. Mosaism in teaching the direct connection of the Deity with mankind by means of His Providence, of judgment, and revelation, places God and man in direct relation to each other. The necessary consequence was, that man perceived this relation to be not only objective, (i. e. existing in the social man) but he felt himself also to be, in his strict individuality, in intimate connection with his Maker; and thus is evolved subjective religion, i. e., man in his individual destiny, his individual position, in fine, in his every relation; and in his conformation, physical, intellectual, and moral. And this view is perfectly consistent; for the all-embracing, all-seeing God, who hath divided this universe into its manifold parts and sections, must have regard, not alone to the species, but to the individual. The 'Writings' thus portray the various emotions experienced by the individual in his relation to his God, in the ever-changing scenes of life; and the conceptions of the Deity induced by these emotions. As the writings of Moses, notwithstanding their nationality

of costume, are emphatically the book of mankind, the Prophets the book of the nations, so are the 'Writings' the book of the individual man. In all ages, therefore, and under all climes, have they ever found their way to the hearts of all God-loving men.

The subject-matter of these Hagiographa, is the suffering and struggling human being. In the vortex of actual life, amid the friction, the contending and selfish efforts of mankind, is he destined to battle. He feels his own strength to be insufficient, and seeks a higher support, an immovable stay, in God. He falls, the power of his adversaries overcomes him. He seeks more efficient help, firmer support, protection, and safety, in God. This it is of which these writings treat; in this consists subjective religion. The richest in these treasures are the Psalms. They are a collection of devotional lyrics, uttering in accents the most touching, in forms and modes of language the most varied, the thoughts, sensations, and emotions of suffering, struggling man. The majority of these Psalms are prayers for deliverance from enemies, for punishment of the godless, who oppress the innocent. Thus the judgment of God is sometimes invoked, sometimes pronounced; for He judges the people, the rulers, and the universe, with inflexible justice. He who trieth the heart and the reins, who knoweth the secrets of all spirits, the all-seeing Lord, He annihilateth the wicked, is unto them who trust in Him, help, shield, banner, saviour, shepherd, refuge, and light. Let every one therefore trust in the Lord, for He is his help and his shield. Unto Him shall men turn in every peril, for He is faithful and full of compassion. Men's unhappiness is often caused by

sin, for the forgiveness of which we must pray. But God's mercy is without limit. He remembereth that we are but dust. He is the protector of the oppressed. He chastiseth, but delivereth not unto death. He is nigh unto the poor and wretched, and granteth victory.

Then again the delivered pours forth his song of thanksgiving, for the salvation and help that God hath vouchsafed unto him in the hour of his sorest peril. And with this is connected the universal song of praise, in which God is addressed as the Creator of the Universe, Almighty Ruler of the Earth, the Revealer of the truth which leadeth man to the right path, the Providence, whose counsels are unsearchable. Unto Him must man submit. Him must he fear, love, and worship. In Him must he rejoice and be glad. Him must he acknowledge as the Eternal God, for ever and ever.

The Psalms must doubtlessly be understood from the subjective point of view. They are not intended to present us with objective doctrine. They express the conceptions, which man, in the various phases of life, forms of the Deity. The pictures are often highly coloured. But every chord of human feeling and aspiration is touched, and the ever-present unfailing conviction of God's existence and government, pours forth into the trembling heart of man, peace, security, and consolation. No writings are more instructive and interesting than these Psalms, the lyric utterances of the Jewish race. They may be compared with the hymns and odes of Pindar, or the chorusses of the Greek tragedy. In the latter, we have the cold marble, wrought by the hand of art into the most perfect forms, and the highest plastic beauty; in the former, the warm palpitating human heart, whence the fresh rapid stream of life gushes freely forth. In these creations we at once clearly perceive the contrast presented, and the missions to be respectively fulfilled, by these, the two most important nations of antiquity, Hellas and Israel. Both have exercised a powerful influence on mankind; the one on temporal or human things, the other on things imperishable, eternal, on the inmost being of man.

The Book of Job treats the same question in all its bearings more exclusively and more extensively, viz.:the actual life of suffering man, in his relation to the Deity. But what is matter of feeling and impulse only in the Psalms, is elevated in Job into a matter of consciousness, artistically elaborated to a definite proposition. The question itself, in its various solutions, assumes a dramatic form. Job himself opens the inquiry-'Why does God permit so much evil to visit man, in this, his brief pilgrimage on earth?' The friends of Job undertake to reply to this query, after the old accepted manner. 'God is just;' every affliction is punishment for transgression. Job refutes this, partly from general, and partly from personal experience. Then every sufferer would be indicated to be criminal, every prosperous man to be a hero of virtue. The contrary is endlessly manifest, since many known sinners enjoy immunity from suffering, and many sufferers are unconscious of guilt, comparable with their sufferings in intensity. A higher solution must be sought, which God in fact Himself declares, viz: everything in nature has its fixed purpose assigned to it by God. This purpose is achieved by the most appropriate means. By virtue of the co-operation and arrangement of these

several purposes, nature exists. These designs are proofs in themselves of the wisdom of the designer. The inevitable deduction, left by the artistic handling of the argument, for the reader himself to make, although prepared in the introduction and conclusion, is this:—an allwise purpose is contained in the vicissitudes and sorrows of human life; these last tend to the continued endurance of the race of man, to the development of the mental power by the exercise of piety and resignation: thus is man led by suffering to a higher goal.

The Book of Job presents a grand picture of human life. As to style, religious depth, and artistic perfection, it has been, and still remains, unequalled. What it contains and sets forth, is yet as true, as unchanged, as though this very day it had first been uttered. The same lamentations over the innumerable ills of life, the same condemnatory judgment upon the fallen, are still heard from the lips of selfish dogmatists. But the consolatory inferences we draw at the present moment from this argument, are not more striking nor sublime, than those furnished by this glorious poem. With all this, a spirit of humanity pervades the book, a deep sympathy for human sorrow, a knowledge of human weakness, touches of a morality the most refined, and homage rendered to wisdom; all these mark it as the utterance of the purest of human hearts, a pearl in the bright coronet formed of the creations of Israel's genius.

While the Book of Job rises to the loftiest sphere of religious meditation, the Proverbs descend to the consideration of practical daily life. The Proverbs are, as a whole, intended to demonstrate the applicability of the law of God to every-day life, and its operation on material existence. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," is one of the opening declarations of the book, and the enforcement of this teaching its unwearied aim. With this fear we stumble not—we keep far removed from evil—we fall into no snares—and we lengthen our days. Unshaken trust in God, firm as the rock, is our shield and our fortress, the surest weapon of defence in life. For God, who abhorreth deception, but who hath pleasure in him who walks in innocence, blesseth the upright, and permitteth him not to fall. True it is, that He leaveth not the righteous unproved; but him whom He loveth the Lord chasteneth, as a father his child; and He ordereth for fixed objects, in wisdom and mercy, all things aright.

We would here subjoin the following brief remarks:-1st. In the Psalms and in the Book of Job we meet with repeated allusions to nature. The Psalms, (especially the 19th and the 104th) place Nature and Revelation in juxta-position, and refer frequently to the works of God in nature, as proofs of the Divine Existence. The Book of Job recurs again and again to nature, and deduces from her operations, the solution of his argument. How different is all within the realms of heathenism. Considering nature as the starting point, it evolved, from the conflict of the various elements in nature, two or more gods; -failing to perceive the unity of nature herself. But the religious idea went forth from God, through Him recognises nature to be one, a uniform single work of the Creator, and perceives in nature, thus understood, its own verification. 2nd. Since the main theme of these Writings is the individual and his idiosyncrasy, they naturally revert more frequently and

more explicitly to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. On the whole, however, in them, as in the books of Moses and the Prophets, this doctrine is rather set forth as a pre-acknowledged, pre-accepted truth,* than insisted on as the basis of all religion, on which the superstructure is to be reared, and which should be the aim and end of religious teaching. Moses and the prophets were alike incomprehensible without the pre-conception of the immortality of the soul; they include it, in truth, in the doctrine of man's creation in the image of his Creator. But their aim and scope is the 'here,' to mould and form this into an independent and religious unity. The Hagiographa are, in this matter, conceived wholly in the Mosaic spirit. And these two characteristics testify that these Writings, are but offshoots from Mosaism their great root, in which are to be found their firm groundwork and significance. But they are, in themselves, the unfolding of the religious Idea in the individual.

Here then we have reached the close of the first period of the existence of the religious Idea, and of its depositaries and bearers, the Hebrew people. That period comprehends two phases,—the founding of the religious idea in Mosaism, and its conquest over heathenism in the midst of the Jewish race, by Prophetism. In this victory it suffered, it is true, the severance of the idea and the life; but by that severance it effected a general diffusion of the religious idea, in its destination for all the human race; and further, it prepared its development in the individual. From this juncture we behold the religious idea stepping forth into a larger arena, into the

^{*} Besides being clearly expressed in passages too numerous for citation.—A. M. G.

whole world of man. At the same time, the Jewish race quits the narrow boundaries of Palestine, to spread itself, in its wide dispersions, over the earth. We pause here. I shall in my next lectures, proceed to the examination of the important subjects of Talmudism, on the one hand, and of Christianity and Moslemism on the other.

LECTURE VI.

THE SECOND TEMPLE-THE ORIGIN OF TALMUDISM.

The first small colonies of Jews (whose numbers were subsequently augmented by other bodies) that returned from the Babylonian captivity to Palestine, were necessarily composed of those exiles, who, faithful to the standard of the Prophets, had kept themselves aloof from the habits and manners and the Idolatry of Babylon, and held fast to Mosaism, though perhaps regarding it merely as a peculiarity of the Jewish race.

Their total alienation from Heathenism was further confirmed by the erection of the Second Temple, by the influence of the three last prophets, and by the efforts of the two upright but somewhat stern legislators, Ezra and Nehemiah. Holding official situations at the Persian Court, and being thereby invested with something of a judicial character, they enforced the observance of many municipal regulations in popular life, and introduced many ordinances for the re-establishment and reorganization of divine worship.

From that moment, all admixture of heathen elements will be found to have wholly and finally disappeared from amid the Jewish race. Happily, under the mild and tolerant sway of the Persian monarchs, centuries of tranquillity passed over the heads of that race—centu-

ries of internal and external growth, during which they acquired organic consistency and firmness. Of these years of peace and progress, nothing can be observed, since nothing is known of them, nor did anything occur in them worthy to be recorded. Even the overthrow of the Persian monarchy by Alexander the Great, caused but a brief interruption to this halcyon interval of calm. This small and no longer independent nation could but bend reed-like beneath the world's mighty events, but could not be crushed by their pressure. So that the dissensions and conflicts among Alexander's generals passed over the land, like a summer shower, the Jews yielding homage now to the Egyptian Ptolemies, now to the Syrian Seleucidæ. The struggle in which the Jews themselves were destined to engage, began when the rest of the world had almost regained tranquillity, and has continued, with but small interruption, from that moment up to the present day. The more firmly the Jews established themselves on the broad basis of Mosaism, the more evident did it become that it presented, not an ideal, but a real contrast to Heathenism, a contrast inherent in the very being, physical and mental, of the Jewish race. The heathen world, restored to peace, awoke to the consciousness that this antagonism existed; it took up arms and combatted it, as for life and death. After Heathenism had thus opposed the Religious Idea within the Hebrew race, and had succumbed to that idea within Judaism itself, foreign heathenism turned to bay, to do battle with it in the persons of the Jews, then and evermore its bearers.

The first champion of Heathenism in the fight against the Religious Idea, was the Seleucide, Antiochus Epiphanes. He sought to exterminate, not the Jews, but Judaism. He used every means to compel the Jews to bend the knee before his idols. Then arose a small band of Jews, to do glorious battle in a glorious cause. Then it was again shown what a handful of people, when bound together by one intense and animating principle, may achieve, even though the power of a world be arrayed against them. As the Greeks fought against the Persian Colossus, the Swiss against the Burgundians and and Austria, so fought the little band of the Maccabees against the host of the Syrian, ten against a thousand. Hurrying from victory to victory, they ere long restored, not only the religious idea, but also freedom and independence to their people and country. Bearing on high the trophies of this triumph, the Jews regained for a time their historical position as a nation among the nations, governed by native rulers, who soon exchanged the priest's mitre for the king's diadem.

But it was the struggle which had quickened into pulsation the life-current in the hearts of the Jews. Tranquillity once restored, the ruling families exhausted themselves by mutual dissensions, splitting the people into parties, that attacked each other with all the virulence of fraternal animosity. Morality and religion were thus undermined. The opposing factions themselves summoned the second champion of Heathenism, the Roman, into Judea, which country he would doubtless soon have visited unbidden, since it lay in his path of conquest.

The people having thus lost their internal self-dependence, by means of the disunion and conflicts of their leaders, submitted almost without resistance to the yoke of Rome. But her rule degenerated soon into unheard-of oppression on the part of the exacting governors, who transplanted the despotism then prevailing

in the imperial court of Rome, to the soil of the provinces. In the Jewish race there yet dwelt a fund of strength, which had long disappeared from the other dependent states of the empire. So soon as discontent and hatred came to prevail between the governors and the governed, it was impossible but that religious strife should speedily ensue. Everything heathen was obnoxious to the Jew, as everything Jewish was ludicrous and contemptible in the eyes of the Roman. To render idolatrous worship to the statues of the Cæsars in the temple, was repugnant and impossible to the Jew, while his incomprehensible refusal was regarded by the Roman as being prompted by a spirit of resistance only. The igniting spark was not long ere it fell on this inflammable heap.

The Jews rose en masse with desperate fury against the Romans, and soon freed their land from the presence of an enemy, whose sway at that very time extended from the Euphrates, over the lands watered by the Danube, the Weser, and the Tweed, to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and from the Atlas Mountains to the sources of the Nile. Two distinct but equally dangerous circumstances co-operated to render a war of extermination inevitable—its fatal issue certain. The first of these was the invasion of Judæa by countless legions, flushed with a long course of conquest under the veteran generalship of Vespasian and Titus. The second and more fatal condition of this impending ruin, was the internal dismemberment of the people, who, lacking one ruling spirit, were torn into factions by their several contending leaders. During the continuance of the war with the Romans, these rival chiefs, some of them animated by the fiercest zeal, others advocating submission

to the invading forces, had even availed themselves of every brief suspension of arms granted by the foreign foe, to renew their bloody and suicidal domestic struggles. In the final conflict, brilliant was the courage, inflexible the firmness, undaunted the perseverance, and heroic the spirit of self-sacrifice, displayed by the Jews. They rushed into the burning temple, snatched the golden seats of the priests from the flames, to cast them on the heads of the besiegers. More than a million Jews fell in this war: 97,000 were taken prisoners. Some of these were put to death, others sold as slaves, others sent to work in the mines; and others reserved to be carried captives to Rome, and there torn in pieces by wild beasts in the public games. The existence of the Jews as a people was annihilated. But did all this involve the annihilation of Judaism? No! in truth. Though in many a page of history the designs of Providence are legible, surely they are nowhere so clearly to be read, so deeply to be revered as in this one. All other nations of antiquity were to perish. The Hebrew Race alone was eternally to endure. And the conditions necessary to its preservation had been long prepared.

A large portion of the Jews of the captivity had remained behind, in the countries washed by the Tigris and the Euphrates. After the re-establishment of their brethren in Palestine, they had there formed themselves into communities. Their several conquerors, from the time of Alexander downwards, had caused large colonies of Jews to be transplanted to the cities they respectively built. The internal dissensions prevailing during the closing years of their national existence, had induced many Jews to emigrate to other countries, long before the destruction of Jerusalem. Thus a wide net of

Jewish communities had been gradually spread over the then known world. Numerous bands of Jews had gathered themselves into communities in various parts throughout the eastern countries of Asia, throughout the whole of Syria, Egypt, and Cyrene, Italy and Greece. Some had wandered into Spain and Gaul, and some had advanced even beyond the Danube and the Rhine. The endurance of Jewdom had thus been long ensured. The fugitives from Palestine found everywhere cities of refuge well prepared to receive them, and from them they could again, in their turn, secure others. The Jews had besides their identity of race, a characteristic which imbued their lives with a purport peculiar to themselves, and wholly distinct from that of the rest of the world, a religious purport. could not therefore, after the loss of their nationality, be amalgamated with their conquerors, as other nations had been, but were forced universally to keep themselves apart and self-dependent. Thus a second time did the religious idea become the salvation of its bearers; that by means of which the Jews achieved their own preservation.

Although the dreadful catastrophe in Asia could not, it is true, at first remain inoperative on the destinies of the dispersed Jewish communities, yet the Jews in Africa and Asia rose again and again in active revolt against the Roman dominion.

After these convulsive and expiring efforts of the love for freedom, in which the lives of hundreds of thousands of Jews were sacrificed, they necessarily lived through a period of peace and security. For Heathenism being itself in a state of progressive dissolution, had no longer the strength requisite to oppose this antago-

nistic principle of Judaism. At length the Jews received, as did all other conquered nations, the right of Roman citizenship, and began by degrees to participate in public life. The struggle was not renewed until Christianity ascended the throne of Rome. It terminated in the entire isolation of the Jews, and their expulsion from civil and municipal society.

A passing glance must now be bestowed on the inner life of Judaism during the second period of Jewish national existence. Judging from external manifestations, we at once perceive the absence of all creative intellectual power. Of this, all the writings that have come down to us from that period, give evidence. They consist, partly of the remnants* of the past, such as the three last prophets, the book of Esther, and the Chronicles: partly of imitations devoid of all originality, and therefore preserved to us by means of translations only, like the Apocrypha; and partly of un-Jewish off-shoots, grafted on a Jewish stem, like Daniel of the Asiatic, Philo of the Egypto-Greek, character, or of a mixture of Greek and Roman, like Josephus. But within this apparent stagnation of Jewish intellect, there was latent and preparing to work itself out, a new and comprehensive growth which had struck root and shot forth its branches, in the last century before the fall of Jerusalem, although its matured fruit was first revealed to the sight of man many centuries after that event.

It has been seen, that early in the annals of Judaism there was introduced the severance of the Idea from the

^{*} Spütlinge der Vergangenheit. Surely this term can scarcely be applied to Malachi, whose mission was all-important, since his closing exhortation, "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant," iv. 4, joins indissolubly the very last with the very first link of the great chain of divine revelation.

Life, which in Mosaism form a Unity. It has been seen also that Prophetism, in fulfilment of its purpose, had, when the popular life had become un-Mosaic, directed its efforts to the development of the Idea. Now that the Jewish race had again devoted itself to Mosaism, it was sought above all things to impart to the life a Mosaic character. The intellectual power of the national mind being at that period exhausted and insignificant, the Mosaic Idea was thrust in the back ground, and the Mosaic life forced prominently forward. But this condition of things was, ere long, disturbed by two circumstances. In the first place, human life can never be raised to a high standard, unless it is animated by that which is, in the abstract, truth. If not so inspired, it must become more or less conventional and soulless. In the second, there existed then so great a diversity in the historical positions of the people, that a national observance of the whole of Mosaism could not be even contemplated. The result of the first circumstance was the strictest adherence to the letter of the Mosaic law, while the Mosaic idea was neither realized nor understood. The consequence of the second was, that the popular every-day life came to require numberless regulations, nowhere contained even in the letter of the Mosaic writings.* Besides, national life had itself produced national customs and national views, which, though not actually un-Mosaic, have no real place and foundation in the writings of Moses. Finally, what further operated in this direction is this, that the law of Moses indicates so much, for the observance of which in practice much detail is required. Allow me to examine these propositions somewhat more closely.

^{*} Their introduction was, in fact, an infringement both of the letter and the spirit, 5 Mos. 4. 2.—A. M. G.

The unfavourable circumstances under which the Israelites entered into possession of the land of Canaan. such as their small numerical strength, and the vicinity of so many hostile nations, by whom their possession of every hand's breadth of territory was disputed, and lastly, their being subservient to a foreign power, were all so many obstacles to the establishment of their polity on the true Mosaic basis, viz., the equal division of the soil. Though the principles of entire personal freedom and equality of civil rights were carried as far as possible into practice, vet by the partial neglect of the Mosaic territorial enactments, an un-Mosaic tendency was imparted to the constitution. This soon became manifest in the non-observance of the Sabbatical Year and of the Jubilee in their true spirit and signification, their ceremonial ordinances being at the same time fulfilled. The Mosaic temple-service was strictly performed, long after its true life had become extinct, under the pressure of a political condition that had suggested other requirements. Family worship, assemblages for devotional purposes in all parts of the country and without the walls of the temple, meetings for instruction and prelections: all these were institutions for which the Pentateuch furnishes no enactment, or for which, (for example, the reading of the law)* Moses provided after a wholly different manner. Either these arrangements were made irrespectively of the Mosaic code, as in the instance just quoted, or it was sought to establish customs ana-

^{*} The Pentateuch fixes reading of the whole law once in every seven years; † now, a portion is read every Sabbath.

⁺ True; that is, for the assembled nation; but its individual study was enjoined on every human being day by day and hour by hour: need I quote 'Hear O Israel!' etc. (5 Mos. 6. 4-10. Compare also Joshua 1. 8).-A. M. G.

logous to the Mosaic institutions. Thus, instead of sacrifices, the offering up of certain prayers was enjoined. But this arrangement was so far opposed to the Mosaic ideal conception of sacrifices, that while they were for the most part voluntary, the prayer was offered by the whole community, and was fixed and obligatory.

What were the inevitable consequences of these varying, and in some respects, mutually counteracting circumstances? One was, the unconditional authority of the Mosaic code; the other, its interpretation by uninspired organs. Of what nature was this interpretation or commentary? It was in part narrowly restricted to the very letter of the law, and yet it was a free interpretation, since it included much foreign matter, which had by its means to be referred to the letter of the law, much extraneous element, whose origin had to be sought and found in that code. This appears to be paradoxical, and yet it is not so: a rational interpretation is directed to the discovery of the true purport and spirit of the text; these once ascertained, they are admitted to be unchangeable. An interpretation of the letter only, has no regard to the rational signification; the commentator's efforts are directed to the search of something predetermined upon as discoverable in the letter. Till this is found, the letter even is freely handled.*

^{*} I select one from many examples. The Talmudists were desirous of finding in the Scriptures the principle of deciding in court and council, according to the majority of votes. For this purpose they select from Exodus 23. 2, "Follow not the multitude for evil; testify not in a matter of right by complying with the multitude, forcing (blending) right." In this text, the Talmudists separated אחרי רבים להטות (after the multitude, forcing right) from the preceding portion of the verse, and they interpret these words by "the majority must be boved to," whereby they deduce the principle of deciding by the majority from a passage which rather conveys a contrary precept. It ought,

Such then was the nature of that, which then and thenceforward was to form and fill the intellectual life of the Jew, and which imparted to the third phase of Judaism-Talmudism-its distinctive and inalienable characteristic. That characteristic was the peculiar interpretation of Holy Writ. This interpretation, Midrasch, was at one and the same time literal in respect of the letter, and free as regards the spirit and meaning. It was also divided into two distinct branches of inquiry; the one was that of the law, the other that of the doctrinal, moral, and historical contents of Scripture. In the latter division, it was necessary that the interpretation should be especially free and unfettered; this mode of explanation gave rise to a huge growth of moral ramifications. Thus was accumulated an inexhaustible store of parables, metaphors, fables, anecdotes, aphorisms

before all, to be remarked, that the supposition of a pious fraud is, in this case, completely out of the question, such being impossible in the presence of the great number of scholars to be found in an entire nation; this reasoning is the simple product of the method followed by the Talmudists in their consideration of the subject. Just as unreasonable would it be to decry as an intentional fraud the mythical interpretation adopted in the Christian church, according to which the whole institution of sacrifices was merely typical of the Christian dispensation, although the verbal meaning of the text is subjected by this mode of interpreting to no less violence than by the Talmudists. In like manner, the Talmudists employ frequently a different reading altogether, notwithstanding the authority of the letter, nay, just because of the letter in the passage cited; for instance, על רב is substituted for על רב, with the view of giving a reason for the formality (observed in courts) of requiring the vote of the younger assessors before the question was put to the more aged. (On this passage vide Rashi, who frankly says, "The Talmudists have many commentaries on this passage, but not one agreeable to the sense of the text, not one based on the words therein contained.")

and proverbs, which, under the name of Agada, contributed to the diffusion of worldly prudence and moral wisdom, and to their circulation as current coin among the people. In the first of these divisions, the Law, it was indispensable that perfect consistency with its letter should exist in the interpretation. Certain rules were therefore adopted, and according to them, the cases were determined, in which, if expedient, the explanation might be limited, and the others in which, if the relative circumstances demanded it, it might be extended. By these rules it was also permitted to reach the desired conclusion by a long series of deductions and inferences. This set of rules, in their collective form, was called the Halacha.

This system was productive of two direct results, of which the one, affecting the material life of the Jews, may be thus defined. The development of this intellectual phase must have been free, as the tendency must have been natural to the people. It induced the formation of an independent body of literati from among the people, who gradually forced the old orders of the priest and the Levite into the back ground. This intellectual movement produced more mental equality among the mass, or, to use a recent phrase, the preponderating power of intelligence. The field of inquiry embraced by the second division referred to the inner life. Its first condition was the fulfilment of the Mosaic life, in so far as its practice was possible, and the amalgamation of all that had grown out of the popular habits and manners with material existence. The smaller the portion of the Mosaic life of which the then circumstances allowed the observance, according to its true spirit and extent, the more rigid was the

adherence to the remnant of ordinances still observed. This gave rise to the three following consequences: 1st. All that could be obeyed in the ceremonial law was held to be religion, its infringement to be sin against God. 2ndly. The law, as presented to the Jew in the code of Moses, was no longer considered binding; but it was binding according to its subsequent interpretation by the commentators. 3rdly. In order to ensure the observance of the Mosaic law, it was superincumbered with restrictions: the fulfilment of these restrictions was held to be the fulfilment of the Mosaic code: * a hedge, it was said, was planted around the law. It will be at once perceived, that the laws were thus multipled a hundredfold, and a direction was imparted to them foreign to Mosaism. 4thly. The popular mind received and adopted the impression, that everything in human existence, from the most insignificant trifle in material life to the most important action involving a first moral principle, was equally to be determined by the law, was to be found specifically provided for in the law. This gave birth to casuistry, or the regulation by the law of every possible individual contingency.

I have thus attempted to place before you the origin and tendencies of Talmudism. Its commencement dates from the last century before the fall of Jerusalem—its development and consolidation from the third—its close from the sixth, century of the vulgar era. I shall therefore consider its contents and purport in a future lecture.

If we would view the subject from a higher point,

[•] Instead, I repeat, of an imperative command being thus broken, "Thou shall not add," etc.—A. M. G.

however, we must enquire what was the real influence of this second phase of Jewish existence, and of the tendency of the Talmud, on the development of the Religious Idea.

The solution of this question is not difficult; for it has been shown that the Religious Idea had overcome its antagonism, the Heathen idea, within the Hebrew race; and further, that when the internal principle of decay within Heathenism had prepared its dissolution in the then civilized world, the Religious Idea was destined to step forth into the general world of man. The Divine Idea, as will be presently seen, could in the first ages of its promulgation, take but partial hold of the mental soil of the human race. It was necessary therefore that it should be preserved in its integrity within Judaism, until such time as mankind, prepared by increased civilization for its reception, should be fitted to accept it, and be imbued with it, entirely and universally. The two-fold mission was thus imparted to the Religious Idea; first, to be partially disseminated among mankind generally-secondly, to be preserved inviolate in the very heart of Judaism. Its preparation for both these conditions formed the second phase of the popular existence of the Jewish race. During this second phase antiquity witnessed the final extinction of Heathenism. The Religious Idea had meantime gathered up the strength and the means by which to endure, in the midst of Judaism, for thousands of coming years. The dissemination of the Religious Idea throughout the world has been effected by means of Christianity, at a later period by Mahomedanism, and by the dispersion of the Israelites over the whole earth. The preservation of the Religious Idea within Judaism, was secured by Talmudism; for Talmudism is but its transformation into the chrysalis, the enveloping it in the cocoon, formed of a web of enactments for material life. Within that web the Religious Idea lay pure and unscathed,* distinct alike from the semi-divine ideas comprised in Christianity and Mahomedanism, and from the remains of Heathenism, then still lingering among mankind.

Whoever recognises in the history of man, † not an entangled skein of accidental circumstances, but in truth a series of cause and effect yet in actual operation, according to the pre-ordained plan of an allwise and divine Providence, must at once perceive that the simultaneous occurrence of the two great events, the rise of Christianity, and the dispersion of the Jews, was not a fortuitous coincidence. He must, on the contrary, be impressed with the marked unity of purpose evident in both these occurrences, a unity, not in their origin and their action, (for Jerusalem was not destroyed by Christianity, nor Christianity diffused by Judaism) but in their aim and result. If, according to the clear and unequivocal declaration of the Prophets, it is ordained that the whole human race is to be subdued by the Religious Idea, it is manifestly necessary that the development of mankind should ever be left free and unshackled, in order that the universal dissemination of the Religious Idea may be the ultimate fruit of that free development. This result could not at once be achieved. The acceptance of the religious idea must be gradual, as the

^{*} And like a graceful mythological emblem, destined one day to emerge into light and life, and bear all spirits aloft on its pinions, to the realms of eternal day.—A.M. G.

⁺ Or, who is not, in the words of the poet, 'The dark idolator of chance,'—A. M. G.

development of man is progressive; the ultimate stage of that progress being its universal acceptance, in the entireness and purity in which it has been preserved for mankind. The first condition necessitated its partial introduction, under the forms of Christianity and Mahomedanism; the second, the preservation of Judaism and of the Jewish race. This destined preservation of the Jewish race and the Religious Idea, not on one spot of earth only, but throughout the world, equally demanded the dispersion of the Israelites over the habitable globe. By the eye of Christianity, this dispersion was long viewed as a curse; and verily a curse it was for the individual outcasts of the Jewish race. who by its means suffered unutterable torments, a martyrdom both of body and spirit. Yet for the Hebrew race, as its children have long known, this very dispersion was a blessing. Abarbanel, even he, who in his troubled pilgrimage, had to fly from Spain to Portugal, from Portugal to Italy, from Italy to Corfu, himself observes,—'By means of the dispersion only were we saved; for when oppressed by the rulers of one country, we have raised our heads, and have been preserved in another.' Nay more! this dispersion has been fraught with blessing for all humanity. As depositaries of the Religious Idea, the Jews were and are everywhere its irrefutable visible witnesses.* In respect and on behalf of the Religious Idea, (and this our further investigation into the existing conditions of man will prove to demonstration) they will evermore exercise fresh and ever-increasing influence over mankind, until that idea shall have acquired universal and undisputed sway over the mental being of the human race. Amid

^{*} Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord.—Isaiah 44. 3.

the vast revolutions and transmutations that were impending over the whole civilized world, when the migrations of the various peoples and races changed the entire face of the known habitable globe, when the senile and expiring nations of antiquity were fast sinking into their long-prepared grave, and when a youthful and vigorous race were destined to subdue the earth, it would have been impossible for the Israelites to have maintained and defended their independent national existence in Palestine. The Jewish people, as a people, had also passed away. But they did not disappear, as other races have disappeared, from among men. The Almighty had provided for them a wholly new and peculiar phase of being. His providence decreed that the race of Israel should arise in the midst of all nations to new life, endowed with inexhaustible strength and unconquerable perseverance. For this new life, the second phase of the national existence had been, both in its internal and external relations, an indispensable preparation. The wider the difference between the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities, (in which the Jews were transported collectively to one fixed place of exile) and their second and final removal and dispersion, the clearer is it made, that during the second national period the preservation of the Religious Idea was prepared and ensured; -within, by means of a concrete system of material enactments derived from the Mosaic law-without, by the dispersion of the Jews before the destruction of Jerusalem.

Here then it becomes necessary to consider Christianity in its relation to Judaism. But as Christianity is the ground on which the Jewish and the Heathen world first came into spiritual contact, it is desirable

that we should inform ourselves somewhat more precisely as to the state of the Heathen world at that moment. With a few brief remarks on this subject, I will, with your permission, close this day's lecture.

In what direction soever we turn our inquiry, we shall at once clearly discern that at this juncture all hitherto existing forms were in a state of decay or of entire decomposition, and that no means of resuscitation or reformation were at hand. The political existence of all nations that had once played an important and independent part in the world's drama, had been annihilated by the arms of Rome. Egypt, Asia-Minor, Northern Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain had been reduced to the insignificant condition of Roman provinces; only there, where a youthful and vigorous race-the Parthians and Germans-poured down from the north and east, had the arms of Rome received a check. The power of Rome, the mistress of the world, began to decline. The republic had been transformed into an empire. To the despotism of the Caesars, had again succeeded the uncurbed personal authority of the procurator. Justice had been displaced by arbitrary rule, in which dwelt combined the insatiable avarice of individuals, and the senseless and profane deification of the emperor.

Heathenism had known but two classes—rulers and slaves; even the much vaunted freedom of the Athenians and Spartans was but the freedom of the dominant families; and of these, the masses of the population were the bond-men. The propitious moment at which the Roman plebeian succeeded in curbing the absolute rule of the patricians, laid a subject world prostrate at the feet of the citizen of Rome. This degeneracy reached its extreme point during the imperial rule of

the Caesars. Save emperors and slaves, nought remained.

The political world was transformed into a multitude of disconnected particles, an assemblage of men devoid of freedom, of organization, and wholly governed (as may be seen from the elections and depositions of the Emperors by the Praetorian Guard) by unbridled passion and brute force. Such was the ultimate result of the social experiment, in that antiquity which had so variously operated on man in his political relations. That a boundless immorality would, in such a condition of things, gain entire ascendancy over society, is evident. The pleasures of the senses, and the possession of the means by which to ensure their enjoyment, were the sole incentives to action. Sensual excess, an indulgence of the appetites bordering on insanity, and such as the world has never since beheld, covetousness, extortion, legacy-hunting denunciations; these comprised the whole range of social activity. The moral sense of man was dead.

There stood Heathenism sunken and depraved, an object of ridicule and contempt in the sight of its own sons, a senseless drama, played by soulless actors. Whoever reads the coarse but biting satires of Lucian, and at the same time calls to mind the worship offered to the degenerate, yet deified emperors, as though they had indeed become Gods, will at once discern in such things the decomposed elements of a decayed organism. Philosophy had a like fate; for the philosophic consciousness of mankind must truly have fallen to the lowest ebb, when so-called philosophers were the most cringing, the most fawning and abject flatterers, who

clothed in flowery and figurative phrases their advocacy of the most shameless scepticism, the lowest morality.

What, save utter despair, could result from such a state of being? When sensual indulgence has reached the point of exhaustion and satiety, a higher yearning makes itself felt; the more keenly and bitterly, the smaller the power left in the burnt-out embers of the soul, to satisfy her own aspirations after light and life. Doubt fills the spirit with deepest sadness, with bitterest anguish at the sense of its own nothingness. Then the slave desires enlargement. If earthly freedom be denied him, he stretches forth his hand to Heaven, and seeks an imagined spiritual liberty on High. Even the most shameless parasite despises him before whom he bends, gnashing his teeth and muttering to himself, 'Had I but your possessions, thus should you render obeisance unto me.' For all these longings, all these aspirations, antiquity could offer nought, no-nought; could yield no satisfaction. For under the dominion of Rome, and the degeneracy of the other nations, Art even she that had been the peculiar creation and attribute of antiquity, had wholly declined.

One only nation still existed, in whom there yet lay a vigorous germ, a strong element of life and being—the Jews, with the Religious Idea. This idea passed from Judaism into Christianity; and, arrayed in this garb, entered the general world of man. She thus received the worn-out old world in her maternal embrace, mitigated the death-struggle for antiquity; and though doubtless no longer wearing her previous aspect, arose with the fresh morning dawn, in the midst of the new races of the earth.

LECTURE VII.

THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO JUDAISM.

It is not without some hesitation that I have undertaken to investigate the subject of which it is this day my duty to treat, viz., the relation of Christianity to Judaism. By every earnest thinker, the passing judgment on that held by the professors of creeds different from his own to be the holiest and the highest, must ever be a matter involving seriousness and deliberation, amounting almost to reluctance. That Christianity cannot be viewed by a Jew in the light in which it is viewed by a Christian, is self-evident. That he should so view it will not, I am sure, be expected; since if he could, he would not be a Jew. To omit this branch of our enquiry is impossible. The method we have adopted in tracing the course of development taken by the religious idea, renders it indispensable that its entrance into the wide arena of the world of man under the form of Christianity should be clearly elucidated; or this very matter, -the development of the religious idea,—would be but imperfectly understood.

Every candid seeker after the truth within the range of our present enquiry, cannot abstain, if a Jew, from closely examining into Christianity; and cannot fail, if a Christian, to desire acquaintance with the estimate formed of the Christian system by the Jewish mind according to the Jewish standard. While therefore strictly adhering to the plan hitherto pursued in these Lectures, and examining Christianity according to the premises I have laid down, I can rest in the confident assurance that my respected hearers must have already become convinced of the earnest desire by which I have been actuated, to judge impartially, and according to the historical and objective standard only. The enlightened members of all religious denominations have assuredly in this era gone so far as to have attained to the conviction, that by free and general enquiry only can a knowledge of truth be acquired; and that to suppress utterances and enforce silence, in order to uphold any system, can have but the effect of precipitating its ruin.

Much however depends on the mode in which judgment is pronounced. Whenever opinions are formed in a spirit of animosity, malignity, exclusion, and depreciation, they should be received with distrust, or rejected with firmness. Such defects are in themselves evidences of immature judgment; for truth, invested with her highest attributes, cannot hate and condemn, she can but correct and instruct. Christianity could never be hated by a true Jew, who knows it to be a great off-shoot of his own stem.

You must now permit me in the first place cursorily to review the ground already traversed; to re-examine the foundations already laid, on which the superstructure is to be reared. It has been seen, that ever since the promulgation of Mosaism up to the period at which we have arrived, the religious idea and the human idea had been continuously and mutually antagonistic. The

human idea, starting from the ego, or principle of self, had thence proceeded to nature and her operations, in order to ascertain their action on man. Thus a dualistic principle was soon declared to prevail in her, by the human idea; -existence and non-existence, -growth and decay. Then a third and modifying power was sought, and the conception formed of the Godhead was that of powers held by three or more divinities. Such are the Sanzai of the Chinese; the Brama, Vischnu, and Siwen of the Indians; the Ormuzd, Ahriman, and Zeruane-Akrene of the Persians. Finally, the human idea came itself to detect the utter nothingness of these conceptions, and thus prepared its own dissolution. Such was the process all antiquity passed through, from the Indians down to the Romans.

In the opposite principle, the religious idea as set forth in Mosaism predicates a God before known by revelation. This God is an absolute existence, a holy, perfect, eternal and supermundane being, the Creator of the world, as the unity of all specialities. This one and only God formed man, as the chief of those specialities, to be a unity composed of body and spirit, endowed with a soul created in the image of God. God sustains the universe; indirectly, by means of the great laws of nature, on which He has set it forth; directly, in His relation to the God-like human spirit, as man's Providence, Judge, Pardoner, and Revealer. The highest principle of morals is declared by Mosaism to be, 'Man shall be holy, as the Lord his God is holy.' This holiness is to be manifested in love to God, love to his neighbour, and in the control exercised by man's moral consciousness over his physical and temporal desires. Mosaism makes imperative on man the

practice of justice and charity, and renders the claim to the latter the inalienable right of the poor. Human society was established by Mosaism on the basis of personal freedom, equality of right, and all possible equality of possession. The unity of the life and of the idea was set forth by Mosaism, which determined the conditions of a life imbued with the religious idea, of a truly religious 'here' below, complete and entire. that in the Jewish people, as in all peoples, the human and natural should become active, was inevitable. Prophetism was therefore compelled by stern reality, to sever the life from the Idea, in order, from out the midst of the heathen life of the Jewish race, to conduct the Idea to safety and victory. By this severance, Prophetism further prepared the religious idea for its destined dissemination throughout mankind. After the religious idea had overcome the heathenism within the Jewish race, it was necessary, in order to its obtaining a like victory over the heathenism prevailing among mankind generally, that it should introduce itself into that general world of man. This introduction could be effected only according to the measure and degree of free development attained by the human race. Though antiquity had been prepared by its previous process of dissolution, for the acceptance of the religious idea, since its vitality was wholly exhausted, vet that acceptance could be but partial. For the development of man's being was yet too imperfect, to fit him to be the recipient of the religious idea, whole, pure, and entire. Christianity is virtually the entrance of this semi-religious idea into the Western, as Moslemism is its introduction into the Eastern, world. To make good this assertion is our present task.

In its execution, we shall have especially to direct our attention to the two first, vet distinct stages of Christianity: the first, its birth within Judaism itself; the second, its introduction into the disorganised world of Heathenism. The first point to be considered is-How and in what manner did Christianity take its rise in Judaism? For the mode of its origin must have mainly determined its whole subsequent character. It has been shown, that at the period at which Christianity took its rise, the mental activity of Judaism had assumed a direction contrary to that previously imparted to it by prophetism. The development of the religious idea had been the achievement of prophetism. The course now pursued was the elaboration of a vast code of material laws, in which was to be embedded the religious idea, in order to preserve it unscathed for a distant future, and to protect it from the vicissitudes attendant on the impending dispersions of Jewdom.* All important as we at once admit this material code to have been, for the historical progress and preservation of the religious idea, it is nevertheless evident, that a life so replete with the observance of rites and ordinances, when deriving no aliment from the inward and natural piety of its followers, must have degenerated into a course of forms and ceremonies, of assumed sanctity and hypocritical fanaticism.

Such a course do the prophets indicate, in their denunciations against the empty, soulless and degraded sacrificial worship. Amid the depravity that prevailed among the Jewish people at the fall of Jerusalem,

^{*} No one can here, it appears to me, form a post-factum judgment of what would have been the result of adherence to the Mosaic code .- A. M. G.

amid a moral degeneracy to which the Talmudic writers allude, this fact must have become doubly manifest. The Pharisees of that period, a body openly condemned by the Talmud also, were the organs of this exaggerated and caricatured ritual.

That this excessive and preponderating share in human life, yielded to the forms of religion, that their abuse and not their use, should bring about their rejection and the renewed enforcement of the idea only, was natural. In obedience to the law of our nature, according to which one extreme is made to generate another and opposite extreme, the wholesale abrogation of the ritual, and the re-establishment of the undivided sway of the idea and the idea only, became the mental striving of the period under review. And in truth, in this alternate production by one extreme of its contrary extreme are involved the necessary conditions of all human progress. The rise of Christianity in the midst of Judaism may therefore simply and justly be defined to be the effort of the human mind to restore validity to the Idea, as opposed to the form.*

Prophetism had placed the Idea in opposition to Heathen life, and had abstained from insisting on the duty of a religious life, only by reason of the want, in the prophetic age, of a due field for its exercise. But at the period we are now occupied in considering, idealism, going beyond just limits, had become opposed in its tendencies to that religious life even, of which the internal essence was the religious idea, and which,

^{*} I adduce as illustrative of this, the repeated allusions made in the first Gospel to the principal commandments (those of the decalogue) as containing the essence of religion.

in its external development only, threatened to degenerate into empty rites.

This produced a two-fold effect. First, Christianity remained inoperative within Judaism; because all that Christianity had to offer in the dominion of the spiritual, Judaism possessed. All that Christianity opposed—the Law—was so interwoven with the mental constitution of the Judaism of that age, as to be a necessity of its nature, and the condition of its future existence. Again, Christianity, in its effort to render the Idea alone valid and influential, being repelled by Jewish life, withdrew further and further from actual life, and laid hold of and pursued the Idea exclusively.

The separation between the Idea and the life, which in Prophetism developed the former at the cost of the latter, and in Talmudism developed the latter at the price of the former, achieved in Christianity its final and entire result. This final result was, that it determined the whole character of Christianity; and it likewise determined the issuing forth of Christianity out of Judaism. This proposition will be fully confirmed by a close observation of Christianity, in the early stages of its growth and progress. In its first utterances, Christianity betrays no opposition to the law of Moses,* but insists on a spiritual acceptation.† Later, it renounces allegiance to the law, and limits adherence to the belief.‡ Finally, it avows itself opposed to the law and combats it.§ From the point of view to

^{* &#}x27;Think not I am come to destroy the law or the prophets... I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.'

⁺ As in relation to the Sabbath.

[#] The synod of the apostles in Jerusalem.

[§] Particularly in the history of the apostles and in the Epistles.

which we in our age have attained, it is easy for us to perceive the necessity of this course of events. For by means only of its total severance of the Idea from Jewish life, was the entrance of the Idea into the Heathen world rendered possible.

This however did not prevent Christianity from being compelled, in its subsequent course of development, to elaborate the idea only, and to cast actual life wholly on one side. Christianity, in fact, denied all independent existence to our earthly phase of being, took refuge in the world to come, and considered the 'here' in its terrestrial relations, as inherently depraved.

Life on earth, according to the Christian system, is a condition of bondage of the immortal spirit, that waits and longs for its enlargement after death. It transmutes finite life out of itself, to a sphere beyond—to a life Hereafter. It places the standard of human action in the world to come, and measures human action in this world after that ideal standard. Secondly, according to the Christian system, all things actual were of necessity self-condemned, and their place in human aspiration filled by an ideal, which, transcending the sphere of humanity, carried man beyond and out of himself. It followed, that for active exercise of the right and active resistance to wrong, Christian morality substituted passive endurance; for control exercised by the moral consciousness of man, humility; for reasonable enjoyment, self-denial and renunciation. Christianity was thus forced to admit, that the religion of the individual, and not of society, was its especial concern. It treats only of the individual man's conduct, in relation to his fellow-man individually. It is the religion of the individual, the highest form of subjective religion,

and closely related to the Hagiographa.* Human society, as such, exists not for Christianity. Of this principle, the precepts, 'Give unto Cæsar that which is Cæsar's,' and 'My kingdom is not of this world,' offer the indirect—as the doctrine of unconditional submission to all the powers that be, repeatedly to be met with in the Epistles, offers the direct exemplification. To this, history furnishes sufficient testimony. For when Christianity existed in all its pristine vigour, it called into being the numerous companies of anchorites, hermits, and devotees, who during life and after death, were revered as saints; it produced conventual and monastic institutions; and the spirit it breathed made the perfect Christian's life, ever to consist in withdrawal from the world of man, in a sublimating devoteeism that removed him out of and above the world of man, and in the renunciation of temporal things. On human society again, as such, Christianity then exerted no marked influence. For even when she ascended the imperial thrones of Rome in the persons of the emperors of the East and West, notwithstanding their reputed devotion to the new faith, their sovereign rule exhibited, as before, alternations of abject weakness and the most unscrupulous despotism. Feudalism also developed itself in Germany, after the introduction of Christianity into that state, previously the home of freedom; and Feudalism is of all institutions, the one most thoroughly opposed to every fundamental principle which Mosaism had advanced as the basis of human society. Finally, the later mutations in the world have sprung from elements equally inimical, in their nature and action, to Christian dogma.

But Christianity had thus come to present a complete contrast to Mosaism. The dominant principles of action

^{*} See Lecture V.

in Mosaism were, the unity of the idea and the life; a religious life on earth, lived by man, fully endowed with all his rights as an independent human being. Moses, and also the Prophets and Writings in his spirit, presupposed the immortality of a soul created in the image of God, to be an accepted truth, but did not make it the sole lever of human action, the sole end and aim of human existence. Mosaism declared human life to have its own definite and independent object; it considered man as man, as a member of the great national family; while Christianity regarded him only as a nursling for futurity. Mosaism further sought to give to society the basis of religion, and therefore insisted upon equality of rights, personal freedom, and all possible equality of possession, as positive and immutable obligations of religion. The spirit of these enactments was of such power, that notwithstanding the mutations and hardships of later ages, the equality of every member of the Jewish polity remains still an active principle of Judaism.* Christianity regarded all municipal concerns as irrelevant to religion. Although the Mosaic theory of the equality of all members of the human family had been retained, nothing had been done to accomplish its realisation, because Christianity had transferred the centre around which its activity was to radiate, to a celestial existence.

It was doubtless this attribute of Christianity, which imparted to it its especial fitness for transplantation into the exhausted soil of Heathenism. It met the requirements of the Heathen world, whose depressed

^{*} Even in an age when wealth was all important to a Jew, it was deemed honourable for the richest Jew to unite his daughter in marriage with a poor but learned man.

condition rendered nought more welcome to the oppressed and despairing race of man, than translation to a sphere, in which earth would be forgotten amid the celestial joys displayed to the longing gaze of faith. Nought could be more welcome, amidst the prevailing slavish subjection and degeneracy, than a 'Kingdom of Heaven,' a bright realm, where all that was crooked on earth would be made straight, where as compensation for the fleeting joys renounced here below, the spirit would reap a rich harvest of eternal bliss. Politically to effect this change presented no difficulty, as the whole state could be made to pass in a night from Heathenism to Christianity. Christianity having been thus evolved from Judaism, the second point to be considered is-'What form did Christianity assume within Heathenism?' Primary Christianity while retaining its close affinity to Mosaism, must here be dismissed from our thoughts, and our attention directed to historical Christianity. Beginning with the Gospel of St. John and the Epistles, we must mark its growth into a Christian Church, its assumption of the fixed dogma of its several successive forms of Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, and finally of the orthodox Protestant Church.*

The more clearly defined our conception of the acceptance by the religious idea of the principle of the freedom of human development, the more natural will it appear to us, that Christianity, while introducing that idea into the heathen world, was so acted upon by Heathenism, as to cause it to amalgamate with itself

^{*} One important phase, a product of modern times, our author omits to mention, 'The Unitarian.' Is not the Christian vessel following the same course as that of Judaism, ascending the stream, till it reaches the fountain of its birth?—A.M.G.

some elements of the human idea. New forms cannot displace old forms of thought, without in some respects being assimilated with the old forms. Man, in accepting into his mental constitution the new, does not wholly and at once cast out the old. The new enters into combination with the old. This is the process of transformation, as carried on by and in individual man. Can that of a whole age be less progressive? Let us examine this matter somewhat more narrowly. Christianity carries with it out of Mosaism the knowledge of the unity of the Godhead, the omniscient Creator of a universe upheld by Him, by means of the great laws of nature on which He set it forth. This general view was preserved in Christianity as the groundwork of its system. In so far then, it was the means by which the diffusion from out of Judaism, of the religious idea among mankind, and its victory over heathenism, were achieved. But the human notion of disunion and of a third and mediating power, was too firmly fixed in the minds of men, not to re-act upon the religious idea. In the midst therefore of the conception of the existence of the One only God, as a Unity, soon came to light in combination with it, that of a threefold divine existence, a Trinity. Between the Christian dogma and heathenism, there existed, it is true, a clear and substantial difference. The trinitarian Godhead of Christianity, was exclusively and wholly good; whereas in Heathenism one of the three divine powers was conceived to be opposed to the other two-the principle of evil. Thus far therefore Christianity again remained true to the religious idea. Yet it could not wholly emancipate itself from the heathen conception of the principle of Evil. And this re-appeared in Christianity, albeit under the form of a

being inferior and subject to the Divinity, though ever present and eternal. Satan, the Devil, a power to be eventually overcome by the power divine, or God. In this again, Christianity had become the antagonism of Mosaism-for Mosaism: 1st emphatically declares the unconditional unity of God, and the perfection of God's works; and 2ndly, gives a general refutation to the principle that evil universally exists, by regarding evil to be a relative condition of the individual. Since Christianity thus set forth evil as an absolute existence, it necessarily declared man to be subjected to its dominion. Christianity carried with it out of Judaism, and subsequently preserved, the idea of the creation of man's soul in the image of God. But while Mosaism admitted the possibility of sin in man, by means of sensuality, Christianity transmuted this possibility into an actuality, and established this as the original sin which man since Adam ever brings with him into the world. God created the first man of a sinless nature; but man, from the beginning, rendered his own nature sinful. Sin therefore is not a fortuitous and relative condition of the individual, but thus becomes an inherent and universal attribute of the human soul. This theory engendered another complete antagonism to Mosaism. Mosaism declared the direct relation of God to man. God judges the actions of men, permits evil consequences to follow evil deeds; but pardons the guilt of the penitent, and restores his soul to purity. According to the Christian dogma, on the contrary, the soul in consequence of original sin, being born in sin, all direct connection between God and man was interrupted. God can no longer be in direct relation with a soul inherently sinful. This state of sinfulness renders

some mediation requisite between God and the sinful soul. As by Adam's act, sin was made eternally present in the human soul, so was some other act called for, by virtue of which man's spirit should be freed from its presence. This act was the martyr's death of the founder of Christianity; and herein was abstract speculation reconducted to its earliest form. The death of one man in his character only of man, having, as was evident, no power to work out atonement for other men, the necessity arose for an impersonation of a portion of the divine nature, for an incarnation of the Godhead, and for his appearance on earth in human form, as the instrument of the redemption of mankind. Christianity once more in this exhibits a total contrast to Mosaism. Mosaism emphatically denounces any impersonation of the Deity.*

The development of these first elements had yet further results. The purification of man's soul from original and inherited sin, by means solely of the vicarious sacrifice of God, in His assumed human form, could not be held to be an accomplished fact. It attained efficacy, by virtue only of man's faith in its truth and sufficiency. That soul alone is saved, by whom this death is accepted as the fount whence salvation flows. Hence follows: 1st. That as this consequence of the death of Jesus, viz., the salvation of the sinful soul after dissolution, could neither be affirmed historically, nor attested by the understanding;† that as on the contrary human reason would suggest its denial, the attainment of the object

^{*} See the 2nd article of the Decalogue; also 5th Book of Moses, 4. 15. 'Thou sawest no similitude on the day when the Lord spake in Horeb.'

⁺ Even if the death of Jesus was susceptible of historical proof, this purport could not be proved.

was declared to be effected only by the acceptance of the unproved fact into the belief. 2ndly. The whole Christian doctrine must therefore be regarded as a mystery, an act not to be comprehended, but to be accepted unconditionally and appealing to the belief alone. 3rdly. As only the believing soul could be saved, any non-believer was excluded from salvation. This exclusion was thus engrafted on the Christian doctrine, and a difference established between the believing and non-believing sections of the world of man.* On all these points likewise, the contrast between Mosaism and Christianity is everywhere apparent. † Mosaism establishes and prophetism confirms the principle, that by his own repentance alone can man be justified; but that God in His mercy pardons every repentant sinner. Mosaism further requires that man shall know God and His Law. It especially declares that God and His Law was not discovered by man, but was given to him by revelation. This revealed law shall be acknowledged and understood by man. † It is no mystery which is to be accepted and believed. The law was confided by God to the consciousness of man, which by its entire comprehension will be imbued with its truth. Lastly, Moses and the prophets never make man's acceptableness in the eyes of God, to be dependant on his confession of certain articles of belief, but on true reverence for the one and only God, to be shown in good works. The Talmudists expressly say- The just of all nations are sharers in eternal life.'

I resume: Christianity carried the Religious Idea out

^{*} St. John, 3. 18. Also 36 v.

^{† 5} Mos. 24. 16. Ezek. 18. 20.

^{‡ 5} Mos. 30. 11—14.

of Judaism into the general world of man, by diffusing among and implanting in mankind the conception, that there is only one God; that the universe is His creation; that the human being is endowed by God with a soul created in God's image; that God is in direct relation to man as Providence, Judge, Pardoner, and Revealer; and that love to God and love to our fellow-man are the highest principles of morality. But Christianity within the world of men could not defend itself against the action on it of the human idea; as is seen in its amalgamating with the conception and being of the one and only God, that of a three-fold divine existence, one of these divine beings appearing on earth in human form; again, in its ascribing original sin to a soul created in God's image, from which sin it was cleansed by the vicarious death of that Divine Being; and lastly, in declaring this deliverance from sin, to be attainable only through faith in its instrument.

In consequence of its historical origin, Christianity entirely abstracted the religious idea from life on earth, by transferring the motive principle to a life to come; by making Religion the educator of mankind for that future world, and thus indicating social and political life to be unworthy and independent of religion, and without the pale of its direct influence. In this, Christianity had become, in its essence, the opposite of Judaism in general, and of the Judaism of that period in particular; the latter being then occupied in combining and arranging a widely-extended system of material enactments, for the specific object of protecting the religious idea from the deteriorating influence of external friction.

Not only in its internal properties, but also in its

external form, had Christianity succumbed beneath the reaction of the general world of man. Christianity had at its origin entered the lists against the vicious employment of the Jewish ceremonial, and only by resting on this basis as its special mission, could it win a successful entrance into the general world of man. But scarcely had it acquired some sway, ere it surrounded itself with a form far from simple in its accessories; and allowed its original characteristic of external simplicity to disappear amid the pomp of a worship that addresses itself to the senses, a gorgeous ceremonial that fascinates the eye. Yet more: passing rapidly through the successive phases which led from Mosaism to Talmudism, Christianity produced an exegesis of the written word, declared it binding, and stigmatised every one who deviated from this interpretation, as heretical and unworthy of salvation. Assuming to have drawn this exposition from a divine source, from the Holy Ghost, it invested it with a plastic form as a Church, and ensured its future propagation by ordained organs or priests. Precisely at the same period at which the priesthood was wholly supplanted in Judaism under its phase of Talmudism, by a numerous body of literati and teachers, the Christian church instituted an order of priests, whose claim to the sacerdotal dignity was determined, not by birth, but by a special consecration. To this priestly order were secured the most important privileges, and a position wholly independent of the laity and the state. Lastly, after primary Christianity had theoretically withdrawn itself from the political arena, so that its influence in the state was null; in asserting its independence of the civil power, it elevated the Church and

the hierarchy above the state; thus rendering the highest civil authority, inferior and subject to the highest spiritual authority. For the unity predicated by Mosaism to exist between religion and society, Christianity substituted a division between church and state, by which the most fearful conflicts were subsequently occasioned.

My respected hearers will have ere this discovered, that I distinguish primary or original Christianity from historical Christianity, and from the recent mutations in the Christian church. I consider primary Christianity to be the endeavour to render valid the idea as opposed to the form of Judaism; but I regard it to have been a direct antagonism to Mosaism, in the dogma I here recapitulate. It withdrew the idea wholly from the life. It placed religion and social life far asunder. It repudiated all participation in the life on earth; and placed man's true sphere of existence, in a life to come. It thus took man out of himself. Mosaism, on the contrary, assumed the immortality of a spirit created in the Divine image, to be an accepted truth, but taught that true human life was a life on earth, a 'here' below, permeated and governed by the religious idea.

The historical Christianity of the Church I consider to have been the means, by which the fundamental thoughts of the religious idea, were carried out of Judaism into the wide world of man. These general views I enumerate, with a brief summary of the modifications produced and the influence exerted by the human idea, as exhibited in the conditions of the historical development of Christianity. The unity of God, who is super-mundane, and the

Creator of the universe;—this unity transmuted into a threefold Deity or Trinity, in opposition to which was a principle of evil, as an absolute existence: a god-like human soul,—yet inherently polluted since Adam, by the presence of original sin: the direct relation of God to man, as Providence, Judge, and Pardoner—yet that relation destroyed by original sin, and renewed by virtue of the death of the Divine Founder of Christianity: these modifications of the religious by the human idea, had for their ultimate result—the binding authority of canonical interpretations, exclusion, priestly domination, the ascendancy of the church over the state, etc.

Of the recent movements in Christianity, I will treat in a future lecture. A rapid glance at the result of our examination of Christianity from the general point of view, and in its historical bearings shows, that Christianity brought the religious idea, out of Judaism into the general world of man; that it overcame the human idea, or heathenism, but that it effected this, only by sacrificing a portion of the religious idea, by adapting itself to the degree of development previously attained by mankind, and by itself entering into combination, with important elements of the human idea. However indispensable this process may have been for the introduction of the religious idea among mankind, and how clear soever the evidence thus afforded of the principle of the freedom of human development within the dominion of the religious idea, yet precisely these conditions it was, which rendered the preservation of the religious idea within Judaism, and the combined existence of Judaism side-by-side with Christianity, an imperative and eternal necessity. For Christianity

in its first elements only, had been the bearer of the religious idea. The whole historical completion of its edifice, formed a new and entire contrast to that idea. Within mankind, Christianity was a ray emitted by the religious idea, whose effulgence, in its action on the collective mind, and in its consolatory influence on countless hearts of men, was and is still, fraught with untold blessing. Christianity bestowed on mankind, in the place of Heathenism, a new religious purport, and proclaimed Love to be the motive principle of human morality. But Christianity was satisfied with the general assertion, and limiting its sphere of action to the individual man, failed to insist on its realisation in the social man. It partially neutralised its own recognition of the principle of Love, by further adopting in its historical development, that of exclusion or election. It cannot therefore, if viewed according to general principles, be accepted as the consummation of the Religious Idea. That idea has yet to await and to achieve its final victory in the world of man.

LECTURE VIII.

THE RELATION OF MAHOMEDANISM TO JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

THE spread of Christianity has been virtually wholly confined to Europe, and to the European colonies in America. In Asia and Africa, it has on the contrary, found no spot on which to take firm root. Not only did the soil of its very birth-places - Palestine and Syria-even though moistened with the blood of its thousand devoted followers who fell in the Crusades, prove uncongenial to its propagation, but it was also speedily ejected from those portions of the neighbouring continent, North and East Africa, where it had flourished during a brief period. Even while regaining the dominion in Spain that it had lost for several previous centuries, it at the same moment witnessed the falling of one of its earliest and most important seats of empire, Constantinople, into the hands of its mighty rival.

Though it may be foreseen that sooner or later, Turkey in Europe will lapse to one of the Christian powers, yet is it clearly manifest, that the grand line of demarcation between the Western and Eastern world must long endure among mankind. Who is then, the successful rival that thus victoriously took her place

by the side of Christianity? Islamism or the religion of Mahomed. The number of its believers greatly exceeds that of the professors of Christianity. We hence perceive that Christianity and Moslemism, (if the Heathenism of Eastern Asia and of Central Africa be excepted, whose votaries are without doubt collectively, numerically the largest body) share the religious government of the world. The professors of Judaism exist equally in the countries where both these, its two derivative creeds, prevail. In the regions of Heathenism, in China, India, and Central Africa, it is remarkable that the Hebrews, though dwelling apart in small and remote settlements, have lost all connection with their brethren of creed and race in other lands.

It is impossible not to concede a deep significance to a religion, that after conquering, as by the stroke of an enchanter, a world into which for six centuries Christianity had sought in vain to penetrate, has filled for twelve hundred years the mental being of a third of mankind. There must at once be recognised in Mahomedanism a singular accordance with the whole character of the Orient, by which it was thus enabled to effect a regeneration of the heathen Eastern world, that Christianity was powerless to achieve. For us especially, according to the standard by which we have to follow the course of the religious idea throughout the world of man, the origin, development, and diffusion of Islamism possess an equal interest with those of Christianity. For us too, another great fact is involved in Islamism. Precisely because we thus see, that the religious idea has not found entrance into the mental world of man by means of Christianity alone, but that Mahomedanism has been equally the vehicle of its

introduction there where Christianity could not gain admittance, do we also perceive that the religious idea is destined for all mankind, and that herein lies the proof of its ultimate and certain victory over all mankind.

With two special observations should our present inquiry be opened. The one is, that the author of Moslemism, Mahomed (unlike the founders of Christianity) is a completely historical personage. By this is meant, that there exist other and authentic records of his life and works besides those his own and his disciples' writings furnish. We know this Mahomed in his virtues and in his failings, in the deceptions he practises, in the terror he inspires. The second is, that Mahomedanism is a religion that was born and cradled beneath the fluttering of war's banner, grew and attained its giant proportions and strength at the point of the sword. While Moses addressed the religious idea to his race alone, and the prophets predicted its victory over the world of man by means of the slow but irresistible power of truth, under the guidance of a divine providence; while Jesus sent his disciples to preach the word to the Heathens, and Christianity only at a later age seized on the sword and spear as a means of diffusing the true faith, Mahomedanism won the allegiance of its very first converts on the battle-field, and its founder declared a war of extermination against unbelievers, to be the duty of the faithful. Significantly enough, out of the rivalry of two towns, Mecca and Medina, did Mahomedanism win its first accession of power; the first champions of Moslemism were in nought better than a horde of predatory and nomadic Bedouins;

and the whole power acquired by Islamism, it attained by methods entirely consistent with its origin. These circumstances should in no way lead us to pronounce a hasty condemnation, but rather induce an opposite judgment. If a religion is upheld of which the founder displayed so much human weakness, and of which the propagation was effected by means so irreligiously violent; if, notwithstanding the frailty of that founder, and the deeds of violence attending its dissemination, this faith, I say, endured and awakened such ardent enthusiasm in its followers, it must have possessed a deep significance, of power to overcome these, its enfeebling accidents. The Arabian empire fell, but Islamism exists. New races and peoples overspread Mahomedan Asia, but they all upheld Islamism. Thus Mahomedanism no more declined with the power of its first converts, than did Christianity with the downfall of Rome. Islamism has ever won to itself the allegiance of each newly-arising eastern nation, as did Christianity that of the various races of northern barbarians by whom, at the period of their migrations, the then civilised world was overspread. Mahomedanism has thus risen superior to its origin. The characteristics of the Oriental nature may at once be recognised in the mode of its dissemination. The inhabitant of the East is incapable of gradual development; he accomplishes everything by sudden impulses. If success attend not these first impulsive efforts, he never attains it. Having once reached a higher point of civilisation by a first vast and energetic effort, at that point he remains at a stand-still during thousands of after years.

Let us in the first place, briefly sketch the life of

Mahomed. He was born in April 571, at Mecca, the capital of Central Arabia, a holy place of pilgrimage for Arab heathen devotees. He was of the honourable lineage of the Kureisch; yet his father was but an obscure merchant in narrow circumstances. He died shortly after Mahomed's birth, and this loss was succeeded in his sixth year, by that of his mother. In his youth, he accompanied his uncle on his mercantile journeys to Syria and Southern Arabia, entered into commerce on his own account, and even, at one period, gained his subsistence as a shepherd. But a new direction was, in the twenty-fifth year of his age, imparted to his whole existence, when his employer, a rich widow, became attached to, and married him. Henceforward he lived almost wholly absorbed in religious meditations, in which he was guided and seconded by his wife's cousin, Waraka Ibn Nanfal, who, having long before rejected the Arabian idolatry, had at one time adopted Judaism, at another, Christianity; had translated several portions of the Bible into Arabic; and had especially held Abraham to be the purest and holiest of God's chosen heroes. Mahomed had from his childhood been subject to fits of epilepsy, ascribed by the Arabians to the visitations of higher spirits. This state of unconsciousness, often of delirium, combined with his religious enlightenment, may have first suggested to him the idea of appearing on the world's theatre as the founder of a new religion, and may have induced in him the belief that he had really received divine revelation. This once conceived and openly declared, rendered amplification of his system necessary. As to his own divine inspiration, it is possible he was subsequently undeceived when he failed to work the miracles he attempted. And this failure caused him frequently to inveigh in the Koran, against the generally accepted belief, that miracles are the incontrovertible proof of prophetic power.

He was forty years of age when he first declared himself to be divinely inspired, but confided this to his nearest relatives only; among these and his immediate friends, he gained adherents, whose number amounted to forty at the expiration of four years. By his public appearance in Mecca, with this small body of followers, as a preacher against idolatry, he necessarily excited his numerous adversaries to violent opposition, so that he was compelled to fly to a distance from Mecca, and live for the most part in concealment. He failed not however to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the periodical return of seasons of pilgrimage, (during which, according to Arabian custom, all feuds and enmity were suspended) to re-appear and preach in Mecca, where he then secured the allegiance of the Medinaites, ever jealous rivals of the Meccans. The former found, on their return to their native town, willing listeners to the doctrines of the Prophet. When his adversaries in Mecca sought his life, he fled to Medina, and ever after declared war in the name of God, against all unbelievers. This flight took place on the 22nd of September, 622, A.c., in the fiftyfirst year of his age, and eleventh of his prophetic mission. He at first exercised his followers in plundering expeditions against the caravans of the Meccans, thereby increasing the number of his own adherents-vanquished 600 Meccans with 314 Mussulmans-attacked the neighbouring independent Jewish colonies, after in vain attempting to allure them to his cause - was de-

feated again and again - betrayed on several occasions great cowardice—concluded peace with his enemies and found his power and the number of his adherents augment so greatly, that he at length surprised and took possession of Mecca at the head of ten thousand believers, which city he thenceforward made his chief seat of empire. A victory gained over a heathen army, raised his authority to its zenith, so that many tribes of Arabs yielded him homage, first only as a temporal leader, but subsequently in his character of prophet. A campaign against the Greeks in Syria being wholly unsuccessful, he confined his attempts to Arabia, where he so strengthened his authority by the exercise of severity and force, that he was enabled, when sixty years of age, to enter Mecca in perfect security at the head of 48,000 believers, and proclaim on Mount Arafa his most important doctrines. Soon after he fell sick, and died on the 8th of June, 632, in the sixty-first year of his age, the twenty-first of his mission, and the eleventh after his flight from Mecca, having within scarcely ten years subjugated the whole of Arabia, and transformed the broken-up Arab tribes into one connected body, inspired with one common sentiment—an ardent desire for war, and bright dreams of victory. Mahomed had ten wives, and more than a like number of female slaves who ranked almost as such. Four sons born to him died in childhood, and one only of his three daughters left any offspring. He permitted each Mussulman to have only four wives, but made an exception to this rule in his own favour. Whilst his many failings in the conjugal relation, and his cruelty towards his enemies, throw a dark shade

on the character of Mahomed, he was simple in his domestic habits, in his dress, and in his food; indulged in no display, surrounded himself with no pomp. His liberality and benevolence were boundless; so that, notwithstanding the vast amount of booty collected by him, he left no treasure at his death.

Though in furtherance of his schemes of policy, he hesitated not to commit the most atrocious barbarities, in other respects he was lenient and generous, visited the sick, attended the dead to the grave, and befriended the oppressed. Mahomed possessed no acquired knowledge whatever; he could neither read nor write; he uttered his prophecies aloud, and, dictating them, caused them to be written on parchment, palm-leaves, bones, stones, and the like. These were collected after his death, by the Kalif Abu Bekr. All found were thrown together without arrangement, and were subsequently copied by Othman, with the suppression only of the textual variations. The Koran is therefore, a collection of 114 chapters or sections, some long, some short, that unconnected and replete with countless repetitions and numerous discrepancies, was, it is evident, never intended by the author to see the light in its present crude form. But as Mahomed named no successor, so did he abstain, from political motives, from arranging his writings in chronological or other order.

The more numerous the contradictions contained in the Koran, the more requisite is it to judge of Mahomedanism, not by the Koran alone, but by its later development also. In respect of the style, it is rather the uncontrolled and passionate fire, than the poetic and artistic elevation by which the readers of the Koran are carried away. That no written utterance in the world contains more that is fabulous than the Koran, may with truth and without prejudice be asserted.

Mahomed's immediate successor even, Abu Bekr, carried the war beyond the confines of Arabia, attacked the Christians, and wrested Syria from the Greeks; but Omar followed up these conquests with wonderful success, subjecting not only Palestine and Persia, but also Egypt and all Northern Africa, to the yoke of Moslemism. Othman and Ali carried their arms further, into Nubia and Bucharia. Thus, as early as half a century after Mahomed's flight to Medina, Moslem rule reached from the boundary of China to the Atlantic Ocean. A small snow-ball, detaching itself from Medina and rolling to Mecca, had grown into a huge avalanche, and overspread half the world.

On proceeding to the examination of the inward constitution of Moslemism, the inquiry which first presents itself is again-How did it originate? It must be stated in reply, that Islamism did not, like Christianity, spring directly out of Judaism. Mahomed was not a Jew, nor, as was the case with respect to Christianity, did a certain inherent necessity, arising within Judaism itself, originate Mahomedanism. Islamism was an entirely free and independent creation from without; an adoption of the religious idea by the outer world. Nevertheless, Moslemism was a product of Judaism, to which it presented a less entire contrast than Christianity. Indeed, Mahomedanism was avowedly based wholly on Judaism and Christianity, whether because Mahomed really perceived that these two religions offered a firm foundation on which to raise his superstructure, or because he thus hoped to obtain the

favour of the partizans of both these creeds. Mahomed therefore, declared Moses and the prophets, Jesus and his disciples, to be his divinely inspired predecessors, whose work he, as the last of the prophets, and the promulgator of the highest truth, was destined to The Koran assumes the Old and New Testaments to be true revelations from God, now receiving completion and solution in the Koran. The greater portion of the Koran is composed of narratives, some extracted from the New, but a far greater number from the Old Testament. As Mahomed's knowledge of the two Scriptures was derived, not from his own perusal of them, but from the reports of others, the process to which he subjected these extracts, partly from ignorance, partly from the admixture of later traditions and arbitrary and fabulous embellishment, so disguised these Bible narratives, as to render them scarcely recognisable.

This mode of its origin determined the character of Islamism. Islamism lays hold of the highest principle of the Religious Idea, and reproduces it pure and undefiled. But having once passed away from this first principle, it consistently elaborated the Heathen element, abstaining from any return to Mosaism, save in certain external accidents. Christianity, on the contrary, modified the very first principle of the Religious Idea; yet, having sprung directly from Judaism, it relapsed constantly, though in an incongruous manner, into Judaism.

The chief doctrine of Islamism is then, the acknowledgment of the existence of one only, eternal, omniscient, incorporeal, and omnipotent God, who created the universe out of nothing, according to His divine will. Of this doctrine, derived from Judaism, Mahomed's statement wholly agrees with that of the Bible. It is true, that he relates the history of the creation with many chronological inaccuracies, yet otherwise in perfect conformity with the writings of Moses, Mahomedanism proclaims this doctrine of the unity of the one supernal God to be the corner-stone of its system, and strenuously upholds it as its chief support. In this, it presented a complete contrast to Arabian idolatry, over which it secured the entire victory of the Religious Idea; but in this, it at the same time formed an equally complete contrast to the developed dogma of Christianity, by which this doctrine had been so entirely modified. In the Koran, nothing is of more frequent recurrence than arguments against the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, and of the human incarnation of God; arguments, advanced sometimes with ardent zeal, sometimes with biting satire. Against Judaism, on the contrary, whose teachings he had adopted, Mahomed enters into no controversy. inveighs only against the Jews, who would not yield to his authority, and whom he accuses of distorting the Scriptures, by which imputation, it is true, he concealed his own falsification of the sacred text.

The less antagonism there was involved in Mahomedanism to Judaism and to the first fundamental views of Christianity, the more strenuous was the effort made by Mahomed to create this antagonism; a necessary result of the blind faith in himself and his prophetic mission which he so ardently desired to awaken. The belief in himself he therefore placed in immediate juxtaposition with the belief in God. "There is no god but God, and Mahomed is His Prophet." This aphorism conveys the two distinguishing tenets of Islamism, of

which the one is incomplete without the other. Whoever acknowledges both these is a Mahomedan, a believer; whoever denies them, if even he owns the existence of one only God, an unbeliever. This aphorism imparted a peculiar direction to Mahomedanism, and established an essential distinction between the believer and unbeliever. The moral worth of man lies not therefore in his actions, but solely in Islamism; that is, in the belief in God and Mahomed. The unbeliever is eternally damned; the believer, if he obeys the Mahomedan law, is sure of eternal bliss. If he does not fulfil it, he is punished during the limited period of four hundred years, and then is permitted to enter the lower spheres of blessedness. But this salvation is not consequent on the merit of the individual; it is a free gift of the mercy of God.

The effect of this was, that Islamism especially contains definite views of salvation and perdition, and invests them with material attributes, that are perfectly in accordance with the character of the East. Hell, as the abode of the damned, and Paradise, as that of the blest, were painted, with their physical sufferings and joys, with all the vividness of colouring that the most lively fancy could invent. Unbelievers were subjected in Hell to fearful tortures, sometimes of heat and sometimes of cold. In Paradise, the blest were regaled with the choicest viands, were attended by the most levely maidens, reposed on the softest carpets; they possessed the costliest treasures, and eternally enjoyed the bloom of manhood. These however were but preparatory torments and preparatory joys; for at the appointed hour the resurrection of the dead will come to pass. Seventy thousand angels will drag Hell by seventy thousand cords before the throne of God. The condemned and the blest are then to be judged anew. The latter will be translated to the heavenly Paradise, which is placed in the seventh heaven, at the foot of the Eternal's throne.

Though in this second article of the Mahomedan belief was involved the same antagonism to Mosaism which existed in historical Christianity, namely, the justification of man by faith only in the respective founders of these religions; this antagonism was rendered still more marked in Christianity, from a divine nature being ascribed to that founder; while in Moslemism he claimed only to be the last and highest of the prophets. Yet the two religions again diverged from each other; Mahomedanism remaining consistently heathen in its bias; Christianity, on the contrary, seeking in its developments to return to the Religious Idea. If his belief alone determines man's claim to salvation, then it follows that his actions possess only relative merit; that is, in so far as he is impelled to them by faith. Then man is not free and self-determining, as the Religious Idea sets forth, but is subjected to the operation of an immutable necessity, since belief or faith is no free-will act of man's spirit. Moslemism derived this article of its creed from Arabian heathenism. It was Sabeanism, whose ground-work was fate in nature, as shown forth in the laws governing the heavenly bodies, by which also the destiny of man is ruled. Islamism therefore declared that God fixes so irrevocably the destiny of man, that let him do or leave undone whatever he may, his appointed fate will ever prevail. Whether he go to the battle or remain at home, said Mahomed, the arrow winged for his breast

will reach it. Sickness overpowers him in the degree appointed by God, whether man apply remedies or not. Fire will burn as decreed by God, whether man seek or not to extinguish it. Men's actions have therefore no direct results, since that which happens is previously determined, irrespectively of man's agency. This strict fatalism of Mahomedanism lies in the very nature of the Eastern, and must have been a powerful engine of success in the schemes of conquest pursued by Mahomed and his successors.

All freedom of action being thus denied to the spirit of man, neither could belief nor unbelief be free operations of the human mind. On the contrary, belief was awakened in man by God; this is repeatedly declared in the Koran. *" And one of you is predestined to be an unbeliever, and another of you is predestined to be a believer." Unbelief proceeded from a being who was the source of all evil, Satan-Eblis; he causes unbelief in men, and leads even the believer to disobey the law of the Prophet. Mahomedanism elaborated the doctrine of the devil, as also the opposite theory of angels, and made these distinct articles of the Islam creed. It is manifest that Mahomed, in pursuance of these dogmas, would pronounce war against unbelievers to be a religious duty, since such war effected the limitation of the devil's power, and the conversion of the posterity of unbelievers into believers. The exclusiveness that is inculcated by Christianity, albeit in its passive form, in Mahomedanism, in conformity with the nature of the East, takes an active character, and assumes the offensive.

Of the direct relation of God to man, no question
* Sale's Koran, chap.lxiv.

could longer be entertained. God was, according to Islamism, a supernal necessity or fate, before whom man was nought save an enslaved being, attaining significance solely through faith in this divine fate and in Mahomed. The life of man had no aim or purport, except faith. In it no general principle of morals (such as Christianity derived from Mosaism and combined with its own system) could be enforced. As however, in the Eastern, the Ideal per se, is not a predominating element, Mahomed was compelled to seek in material life a fulcrum for his religious system. We have consequently not to expect any consistent unity of the Idea and the life, as established by Mosaism; for life itself was of no import, according to Mahomedanism. In it there was no connecting link between the Idea and the life; for the creation of the soul of man in God's image, and with it the sanctification of man in God, had disappeared in Islamism. It therefore enforced, but did not consistently develop, certain external and material circumstances only of human existence. The things it commanded were, purifications, fasts, prayers repeated five times daily, alms-giving, and if possible, a pilgrimage to Mecca. The things interdicted were, the drinking of wine, the eating of swine's flesh-of blood-of the flesh of such animals as have died of themselves or have been suffocated or killed by a blow, or torn by a wild beast-and all games of chance. These ordinances were partly borrowed from the neighbouring heathen nations, partly derived from Mosaism. With these was combined a body of municipal regulations regarding marriage, inheritances, murder, and theft. For a murder, the relatives were free to accept, at their option, compensation in money; while to the thief the severer punishment was adjudged of having his right hand chopped off.

The stronger was the tendency prevailing in Islamism to set forth and consolidate religious belief by means of political power, the more rapidly did Religion and the State become identified. The kingdom of the faithful comprehends therefore both Church and State. The Kaliph or Sultan, is the Vicegerent of Mahomed, the head of the Mahomedan Church; and the grades below him are, like him, either servants of the sword, under the names of Vizirs and Pashas, or teachers and commanders, under the names of Imaums and Ulemas. Thus, while in Mosaism religion and society should be in strict accordance, it was inevitable that Christianity, by the separation, in its system, of religion and society, should originate a severance of Church and State. In Islamism, on the contrary, Church and State are identified; so that a new sect could arise only in another statefor example, Turkey and Persia. We therefore recognise in Islamism, the passing of the Religious Idea out of Judaism into Eastern heathenism. The doctrine of the one super-mundane God, won to itself the stedfast allegiance of the Eastern world. Islamism however, while it held fast instead of, like Christianity, modifying this fundamental principle, was powerless to overcome other and minor existing heathen elements. The creation of man in his Maker's image, and the thereon consequent freedom of man, succumbed beneath the heathen conception of the law of necessity. The direct relation of God to man, as also his sanctification by morality, resolved themselves into the one condition of the validity of faith only. Equality of right and personal freedom were rendered null by the action

of slavery; by the personal authority exercised by believers; by the war waged against unbelievers; by the principle of election, and exclusion; and by the identification of Religion and State. Charity took the form of alms-giving. The immortality of the spirit was limited by the fantastic foreshadowing of a future existence, devoted to unbridled sensuality.

After this manner did that Mahomedanism, whose first principles were derived from Mosaism, become in its subsequent development wholly antagonistic to the Mosaic system. The relation of Islamism to Christianity bore again a different character. In consequence of its strict adherence to the doctrine of the Unity, and of the modification by Christianity of this docrine into that of the Trinity, Islamism became opposed to Christianity. Irrespective of this one point of divergence, Islamism has considerable analogy with Christianity, and it is perhaps more consistent in its development than Christianity itself. Both religions inculcate justification by faith; in both the standard of value of human action, is faith alone. Both promise eternal bliss to the believer only. But Christianity is inconsistent, in its retention of doctrines belonging to the Religious Idea, namely, Divine Providence, the freedom of man, and the laws of morality. Islamism is consistent in declaring Fate or Necessity to be the arbiter of human destiny, and morality to consist exclusively in the practice of certain prescribed ordinances of religion. From this inconsistency of the Christian, and consistency of the Mahomedan system, resulted the principal conditions marking their respective histories. By virtue of this inconsistency, the path of progress was opened in Christianity. By its means, the great conflict was

prepared, in which the Christian intellect has been engaged unremittingly for centuries. Whether or not is salvation attainable by faith alone? In this question, the consistency of the Christian dogma is wholly involved; for with the elements of the Religious Idea indwelling Christianity, is this question closely linked. In consistent Mahomedanism, progress or development was impossible; since by its very system, all such progress was arrested and repressed. A human being, whose destiny necessity alone determines, can do nought save believe, and if he have the power, remove the unbeliever from his path.

To Christianity therefore, the road to the Religious Idea is open; for the Christian system gradually resolves itself into the Religious Idea. Islamism on the contrary, can but fall into decay under the action of the Religious Idea; and, the point of annihilation attained, must be succeeded by that Idea itself.

The final result of this inquiry into the respective natures of Islamism and Christianity is then, as follows. The Religious Idea, as founded by Mosaism, after overcoming heathenism in the Jewish race, and securing in that race depositaries wholly devoted to their mission, passed in Christianity and Moslemism, out of Judaism (only as an Idea however, and without control over material life) into the general world of man. Under the form of Christianity, it overcame the disorganised Heathenism of the West; under that of Islamism, the feebly existing remnants of Heathenism in the East. In both religions, the Religious Idea was so amalgamated with, and modified by, elements of the heathen idea, that in Christianity it retained its hold on the human mind, as idea only; while in rigidly consistent

Moslemism, the heathen element preponderated. Judaism therefore remained the bearer of the Religious Idea, whole and entire, though combining it in Talmudism with a newly-elaborated code of enactments, in order to preserve it in the dispersion of the Jewish race, from the new antagonisms of Christianity and Islamism, for the future of mankind.

LECTURE IX.

THE JEWS IN THEIR DISPERSIONS.

In the foregoing lectures we sought to elucidate the relation of Christianity and Islamism to the Religious Idea, and thence to deduce the necessity for the continued existence in Judaism of the religious idea in its completeness. Were I to adhere strictly to the natural order of the subjects to be treated in these lectures, it would certainly indicate that we should now proceed to consider the manner and mode of this continued existence in Talmudism; and also (having already discussed the rise of Talmudism previous to Christianity) the purport and character of Talmudism itself.

I deem it advisable, nevertheless, first to call your attention to the phase of existence exhibited in the receptacles of this Talmudic-Judaism—Jewdom. And for what reason? you will enquire. Talmudism is so peculiar a creation, the result of such peculiar intellectual tendencies, that it is impossible to comprehend its nature, unless we previously understand the object for which it was designed—unless we have previously recognised its aim, its scope, and its indispensability. If it has been ascertained—first, that the preservation of Jewdom was necessary to the endurance of the religious idea; and secondly, that by Talmudism alone

the continued existence of Jewdom could be secured; we shall have possessed ourselves of the guiding thread, without which we might wander pathless in its vast and intricate labyrinths.

I bespeak your attention to-day therefore to the history of the Jews in their dispersion. I must premise however, that it is foreign to the task I have undertaken to give utterance to the just lamentations, which an intimate acquaintance with a history, whose every page, nay, whose every line, whose every letter is written in blood, may well wring from the sincere friend of humanity. This blood was not shed on the battle-field, where the destinies of nations were decided; nor was this martyrdom endured as expiation for crime, but this life-stream was pressed from the heart, this martyrdom crushed the limbs, of a race of men, who, guiltless of wrong against the lives or the property of their fellow-beings, sought but liberty to live true to their consciences and their God. History, like her eternal sister, Nature, possesses the great privilege of recording the general results of events, and of passing silently over the griefs and sufferings laid successively by individuals on the altar of the general good. The uninterrupted and eternal production of life is the law of nature. But life necessitates death. Countless old generations must die that countless new generations may be born. In order to sustain life nature must destroy life. In like manner, history requires the suffering and the annihilation of millions of individual men, in order to secure to the race of man continued and progressive development, and to prepare for it an ever greater future, an ever more glorious existence. Judged according to this standard, the thousand holocausts

which the annals of every people record are recognised to have been offered for a loftier end. History, which would otherwise present a melancholy picture of tyranny and slavery, of force and thraldom, of human sufferings and passions, becomes, when viewed in this light, a solemn record of the eternal strivings of mankind for higher objects, of its aspirations for the conquest of truth and right.

Let us thus look upon the history of Jewdom in its dispersions, and we shall at once perceive, that these dispersions had for aim and end the preservation of the Religious Idea; and that all that the Jews, its depositaries and bearers, were called upon to endure, all their sufferings during fifteen centuries (of which sufferings, alas! many still continue) were a necessity which in the fulfilment of their sublime mission could not be averted. Nay, instead of the remembrance of the evil treatment received by this peaceable people causing us to mourn, the thought should rather inspire us with feelings of admiration at the inward power of the spirit, enabling a whole race to conquer all disasters and defy all calamities. What more does-Jewdom desire? It has gained the victory. The world sought to annihilate it, and yet Jewdom exists. The world strove to render it dumb, and yet Jewdom speaks, speaks now, even louder and more audibly than ever, in the ears of mankind. Yet more-Jewdom sees the animosity which prevailed against her daily diminish—hears the world rescind daily its hostile edicts feels her sufferings and anguish pass away, virulence and oppression gradually die out. Jewdom may with truth exclaim, 'I have endured to the end; and this endurance has won its reward.' It has achieved that which it was its task to accomplish; it has preserved the religious idea for the great future of mankind. Let us therefore not deem the history of Jewdom in its dispersions to be but a blood-stained record of uniform oppression and violence. Let us on the contrary, recognise it to be that which it truly is—the conflict of the Spirit with its antagonisms for the eternal preservation of the Religious Idea. Seen under this aspect the existence of the Jewish people is neither a mystic riddle, as by some it has been supposed to be, for the key to its solution lies at hand; nor is it a mournful picture veiled in sadness; it is a brilliant image, delineating the power of the immortal soul of man.

We repeat—the sufferings of the Jewish race, from the fourth century down to the present time, their exclusion from political society, the persecutions they have endured throughout the world, were the necessary conditions of the fulfilment of their holy mission. This proposition we now proceed to examine and to verify.

When a nation loses its independence, one of two consequences must ensue; either it is destroyed in the last struggle, or (and this is but another form of destruction) it is amalgamated with its conquerors. The nation may be preserved in its separate members, but in its collective form, its especial purpose, its nationality in fine, it exists no longer. To the existence of the Jewish race no such close was appointed; for the fulfilment of its lofty mission forbad alike its annihilation and its amalgamation with its conquerors. That race was dispersed, retaining in its dispersion its peculiar character. This dispersion, as we have shown in a former lecture, was the instrument of its material salvation. Had this numerically insignificant nation (the smallest of all the peoples of the earth) remained in

Palestine, it could not have retained its integrity amid the irruptions of the barbarians, the conquests of the Mahomedan Arabians, the incursions of Zhengiskhan and of the Saracens and Turkomans. That it had been conquered and dismembered by the tolerant Romans before the outbreak of these wars of devastation and of the Crusades, was a beneficent ordination of the Almighty Ruler of the Universe, and an evidence of His governing providence.

The existence of the Jewish race as a people was not necessary. Indeed the accomplishment of their sacred task was far more powerfully aided by their dispersion. Through the absence of all political and municipal vitality in the numerous isolated communities, was this, their task more promptly and efficiently performed. The religious idea was freed by the dispersion of the Jews from the trammelling influence of political and municipal life, and space and opportunity were secured to its depositaries for their own and its preservation.

But for this end it was also necessary, that the Jews should be placed in a position which would prevent their amalgamation with the dominant nation in whose centre they respectively dwelt. On this point I am anxious to avoid misapprehension. I would therefore observe, that I here refer exclusively to the times at which nations were specifically ruled by the two new churches, in part antagonistic to the religious idea, Christianity and Moslemism, then in their most dogmatic stage of development: an era at which the political amalgamation of the Hebrew race would have been inevitably combined with an absorption of the religious idea into the forms of Christianity and Islamism; an age, as will be admitted, wholly different in its character

from the present time, and inducing consequently wholly different conditions of existence.

That the Jewish race should assume in their dispersions, a distinctive and isolating mental costume and character, which should place them in strong contrast to the dominant churches, (and this idiosyncracy was secured to them by Talmudism) and that their temporal position should be exclusive in its tendency, so as to render them wholly dependent on themselves and their own resources, (a state of being imposed on them by the iron rule of the middle ages) was a historical necessity. Both conditions were indispensable to the preservation of the Jewish race in its integrity, and both were fulfilled.

It may be objected, and with truth if the material fact be alone considered, that the social position of the Jews and the oppression and suffering to which they were exposed, were virtually induced by the peculiarities to which the race so pertinaciously adhered. But if the Jews had not, both from choice and necessity, preserved their individuality, their fusion with the other dominant creeds would have been inevitable; and true it certainly is, that in their new garb of Christian and Mahomedan they would have had nothing to endure. The service of the Religious Idea rendered this immunity impossible. Nor does this afford to the dominant churches the slightest justification for the tyranny and cruelty exercised by them towards the Hebrew race. The peculiarity of my fellow-man, as long as it does no injury to society, in no way gives me the right to injure him in life, property, and honour; nor to beat him to death, either morally or physically. The preservation of this peculiarity was the only reproach cast

upon the Jews after they had been degraded to the very lowest social position by their oppressors. It has, however, I trust, been clearly shown, that for this condition of things there existed an historical necessity. To the Jewish race it was given to preserve within itself the religious idea, unscathed by the antagonisms of the dominant Christian and Mahomedan churches. The only means by which this could be carried out was, the adoption of a peculiar external form of religious life. So soon as the dominant churches came to comprehend the antagonisms to their own system inherent in Judaism, they naturally sought to annihilate Judaism, or to thrust aside and supplant it. The necessary consequences of this animosity were the constant persecutions and banishments of the Jews, and their political and municipal expulsion whether as communities or as individuals.

Another historical feature of the middle ages was the feudal system. Its most marked tendency was the subdivision of the state into guilds or companies. Feudalism split up the aggregate of society into many separate bodies, and assigned to each a particular position and constitution, and individual rights and privileges. Instead of erecting the state on the universal basis of equal and general rights, instead of comprehending each and every portion of society as constituting an integral part of the whole social fabric, instead of recognising the people collectively to be one body politic, feudalism divides and subdivides them, according to a certain fixed scheme, from the monarch down to the serf, into classes, guilds, corporations, and arranges them in orders, companies, etc., that stand to each other in the relative positions of inferior and superior.

What post was appointed to the Jew in this feudal state? What rank was he to hold in this scheme? Neither amid the nobles, nor the guilds of the towns, nor the serfdom of the peasant, would it concede a place to the Hebrew. Feudalism condemned the Jew to remain a foreign excrescence, an outcast from them all. By feudalism were the Jews considered to be but appendages of the monarch, who in his gracious clemency tolerated their presence as imperial or royal menials. They paid tribute to the sovereign, were under his immediate protection, which he could grant, or rather sell to them, or withhold from them, at his royal pleasure. They were thus denied all rights, were compelled to dwell in separate quarters of the towns, were forbidden to hold land and to pursue any trade. But one alternative was allowed, but one dark retreat afforded them, whence their fellow-men shrunk in disgust. Permission was accorded them to wander as hawkers, pedlars, and money-lenders, foot-sore and weary, from place to place.* So abject was the plight to which the feudal system had reduced the sons of Israel; those who in Palestine had been a free and agricultural people, in Rome Roman citizens, were now condemned to be hirelings and menials, earning their exile's bread in the land of their birth by hawking and usury. Princes and emperors pledged their right to the tenure of Jews, sometimes to towns, sometimes to feudal lords of higher or lower degree. In other instances they conceded their claim to the servitude of the Jews for payment, or in compliance with petitions

^{*} True were then the poet's words:-

[&]quot;The wild dove hath her nest, the fox his cave, Mankind their country, Israel but the grave."

or threats, to certain circles and towns. From this arbitrary and lawless rule to which they were subjected, other and serious evils resulted to the Jews. The callings they were permitted to pursue, acted prejudicially on their moral condition. It may with truth be asserted, that the highest credit redounds to the Jewish race, that under the pressure of circumstances so degrading, they not only were not wholly demoralised, but preserved a freshness of spirit and a strength of character, which they mainly derived from the peculiar constitution of their spiritual and religious life. other instances again, these pursuits brought them constantly into collision with great and small. The borrower hates the lender; the more deeply he is indebted, the more entirely he is in the power of his creditor, the more anxious is he to set him aside by physical force, particularly in an age when might made right, and when that lender was without arms and without legal defence. Thus the longer the Jews remained in any one locality, the more imminent and certain were their persecution and expulsion, simply because the greater was the number of those whose interest it was to effect their removal.

A third and necessary consequence was, that as the snail ever seeks shelter within its shelly tenement from the bruising heel of the passer-by, so the persecuted Jew ever withdrew deeper and deeper into intellectual seclusion. All spiritual connection with other nations gradually ceased. An attachment to scientific pursuits, which had endured to a much later period (even so late as the commencement of the fifteenth century) among the Jews than among the Arabians and Christians, expired at length amid the universal persecutions

to which they were subjected, particularly those which accompanied their expulsion from Spain. At the era when the taste for classical studies was revived, and when the other European peoples gladly shook off their long intellectual lethargy, no ray of morning light could penetrate into the dark Ghetto or Jews' quarter, and dawn on the mental vision of the crouching and hopefallen son of Abraham. Even religious speculation was arrested in the crushed spirits, that were only permanently saved from entire paralysation by the exciting study of the Talmud whetting the edge of intellectual subtlety, though this was limited to the analytical disquisitions of casuistry. Of this the result is manifest; the ecclesiastical system of the middle ages sought, in its spirit of exclusiveness, to annihilate the Jews, since in Judaism was included the most uncompromising antagonism to that exclusiveness—the Religious Idea. Where they could not succeed in extirpating, they tried to expel them from municipal society. Feudalism, amid its divisions and subdivisions that virtually denied the equality of human rights, had no place for the outcasts of the Church—the rejected Hebrews. It placed them without the pale of law and right, and as it transformed the peasantry into the bondmen (serfs) of the nobles, so it made the Jews to be the bondmen (serving-men) of the monarch. Yet as compared with the Church, the feudal system was the salvation of Jewdom. From the personal influence of the monarch. they often derived protection; seeing that as occasion might be, the sovereigns either thought more tolerantly or felt more humanely than the petty tyrants, their subjects; or they needed the gold of the Jews, their loans, the purchase-money for protection; or they

were impelled to uphold them by a spirit of opposition to the church, which spirit, as is well known, was not unfrequently rife in Christendom. And the Jews, in truth, required nought, save according to the necessities of the hour, a few spots of earth on which to exist, to weather the storm, and to outlive the days of menaced extermination.

If we have now made clear the historical necessity for the position of the Jews in the middle ages, as also the conditions by which it was attained, let us proceed briefly to review the facts as they arose.

After the final conflicts with the pagan Romans, the Jews had obtained the full rights of Roman citizenship, and during its enjoyment, gained a considerable degree of prosperity and possessed entire civil and religious freedom, in so far as the former anywhere existed. The first Roman emperors who adopted the Christian religion, were compelled to exercise their rule tolerantly, in their half-heathen, half-Christian dominions. So soon, however, as the Christian church obtained temporal sway, it began to oppose the Jews, even in their very existence. Bishops who were held to be shining lights among the church Fathers, such as the holy Ambrosius, Cyril, and others, hurled anathemas and excited the populace against the Jews. Synagogues were reduced to ashes, whole communities compelled by means of murder and plunder to self-expatriation. The councils having recognised that the Jews were not to be won over to Christianity in the mass, zealously opposed all peaceful social intercourse with them. Marriages between Jews and Christians were interdicted; the Christians were forbidden even to eat with the Jew; the Jews to have Christian slaves and servants, while

the Christians were allowed to employ Jews in these capacities. Under such influence, the emperors issued successive decrees, by which the municipal condition of the Jews became more and more fettered; they were expelled from the army, excluded from the civil service, and were at length deprived of all offices of honour in the municipalities till under the emperors Honorius and Arcadius in the year 430, they were wholly despoiled of all civil rights, and degraded to the very lowest class among the people. It is here worthy of special note, that these very decrees (preserved to us in the Codex Theodosianus) declare the Jews to be innocent, and thus testify that they were issued on religious grounds only. For these decrees, while successively depriving the Jews of one right after the other, contain consolatory and laudatory expressions, and refer to such remnants of civil liberty as were preserved, till the final stroke was put to this cruel spoliation. Thus the church had deprived the Jews of all legal rights, had excluded them from all civil society, long before feudalism had come into existence.

When Moslemism subdued and overspread the Eastern world, it assumed politically only, an attitude hostile to the Jews. Islamism sought but empire and never practised religious persecution against the Israelites. When excluding the Jews from public functions (those connected with the financial administration excepted) and even when depriving them of privileges enjoyed by true believers, as their right, Mahomedanism granted to the Israelites religious toleration; but when the East early relapsed into a state of stagnation and non-progress, when the elements of despotism developed themselves more and more in Mahomedan rule, the

Jews participated in this degeneracy, and became an ignorant, motionless, spiritless mass.

In Gaul and Spain, the Jews enjoyed under the Goths the full rights of citizenship. This rendered it the more natural that the Catholic Franks should regard them as adversaries, should deprive them of their legal immunities, and in obedience to the behests of the clergy, should interfere with the freedom of their religious worship, encroach upon their possessions, and coerce them to accept baptism. In Spain, therefore, the Jews hailed the advent of the Moors as that of deliverers, who ensured to them renewed security and peace.

In the extensive dominions of Charles the Great, at the time when feudalism began to prevail, the Jews were of infinite service in the state. Their frequent journeys, their wide-spreading connections, their acquaintance with all parts of the empire, their dexterity, tact and activity, singularly qualified them for the performance of business of various kinds; in circumstances too, where the ignorance of the great and even of the ecclesiastics, and the abject condition of the people, would have given rise to considerable embarrassment. On these accounts favour was shown them; permission to hold landed property, and protection against encroachment and oppression were granted them. The weaker however the royal rule of Charles' and Louis' successors became, the more enmity the clergy and councils shewed towards the Jews, the more the feudal system developed itself, the deeper sank the Jewish race into the condition we have above described; demands upon them for money became more and more numerous; taxes on beds, parchments and kitchens, taxes for comings-in and goings-out, followed in rapid

succession, and formed at least one source of the interest entertained by the monarch in the presence of Jews in his dominions. Scarcely, however, had the feudal system assigned to the Israelites a position which, though denying them all rights, was yet determined by law, when the church, to whose power the Crusades had given a fresh impulse, reintroduced in an extended form the persecution of the Jews throughout Europe. The first outbreak of the Crusades reached the Jews, and the flames spread from its birth-place, Treves, over the whole empire. Metz, Cologne, Worms, Mayence, Speyer, prepared destruction and death to the proscribed sons of Israel. They fled to Moravia, Silesia and Poland. After the close of the Crusades, the revival of the accusations against them of purloining the host and of drinking the blood of Christian children, excited the people to frenzy and to deeds of blood, and thousands of Jews without distinction of age or sex, were mercilessly sacrificed. The carnage began on this occasion in Switzerland and extended to the borders of Poland. These abominations did not cease till the years of the Reformation; and even then were occasionally revived; while in their social position they were even the more enslaved; they were denied all connection with human society, they were excluded from all participation in the world's movements. They paid tribute for their very bodies like the beasts of the field.

While often exposed to murderous violence on the blood-stained soil of Germany, but allowed to exist as a a race, they were repeatedly expelled from Spain, France, and England. From Spain, where under the Moorish rule the Jews had attained a high, social, literary, and scientific position, they were in the year 1492 wholly

expelled by the expeller of the Moors, Ferdinand. Three hundred thousand left their beautiful fatherland; of these some perished by the way, others fled to Barbary, and others sought refuge in Turkey and Holland. Four times were the Jews banished from France, and as frequently recalled. In 1290, they were driven from England, where they had long dwelt, but where their exclusion from all save financial business had especially exposed them to the exactions of petty sovereigns. In the time of Cromwell they were re-admitted into Great Britain. After the successful struggle in the Netherlands, against the tyranny of Philip II., they found a ready asylum in that country, and from the commencement a recognition of their freedom and rights.

We thus perceive, that until the close of the last century, the Jews remained wholly excluded from municipal society, lived in separate quarters of the town, were interdicted from holding land, from exercising certain trades and callings, from pursuing agriculture, from entering into commercial pursuits, and from adopting the vocation of teachers. They were further excluded from the civil and municipal services of the State, and were thus forced to the exclusive assumption, as the sole means by which to exist, of the callings of money-lenders, hawkers and pedlars; and even in these, were subjected to enormous taxes, and to the payment of protection-money and head-money. It may be truly said with respect to their moral treatment, that they were everywhere exposed to contempt and hatred, everywhere despised and oppressed. Forbidden to approach the academies, whether of science or art, shut out from intellectual communion with the rest of the family of man,-they were thus, for mental food, cast

upon the pages of the Talmud alone. By a singular accident, the faculty of medicine formed the sole exception to this wholesale prohibition.

Yet notwithstanding all this, notwithstanding the fearful passage through fifteen hundred years of misery, strong elements of life were yet latent in the bosom of Judaism. The first of these was their inflexible fidelity to the religious idea, and its elaboration in Talmudism, which fidelity neither the horror of death, nor the martyrdom of contempt and scorn, nor the snare of the tempter was of power to shake. The Jews everywhere saw close at hand the boundary line over which, if they passed, sorrow and suffering were left behindtheir passage to Christianity or to Mahomedanism; but over that boundary they passed not. And this fidelity was not the appanage of the chosen few, of the best spirits among them, but of the mass; of the last, as of the first members of their race. Besides this, they found within their own communities, cities of refuge to which to flee, which offered them protection from the infliction of outward injustice and maltreatment. Congregational life never ceased from the midst of them. Wherever ten Jews were assembled in one locality, they formed themselves into a congregation, as though they had been dwelling upon the free soil of Palestine; -a congregation whose fundamental principles were everywhere personal equality, free choice of their officials, in which dwelt not a trace of the custom of life-tenure or hereditary succession; a distinct, yet powerful echo of the voice of Mosaism. Within such congregations, the synagogue and its service were the first objects of care; then charitable institutions for the relief of the sick, the indigent, the old and the imprisoned; for poor brides, for the dying, and for the interment of the dead. The next meteors of solicitude were the schools, some destined for the instruction of youth, others of adults, in which the subjects taught were naturally restricted to the domain of Talmudic and Rabbinical learning. In this congregational life, the Jews found not only inexhaustible sources of indemnification for external evils and some means to avert them, but also partial compensation for their exclusion from all participation in general and political existence.

A second shelter the Jew found in the sanctuary of domestic or family life. Repulsed from without, man seeks consolation in the arms of those dear ones belonging to him. The threshold of his house is the boundary-stone beyond which scorn and contumely cannot pass. Within, he finds the love, esteem, and reverence denied him without. Among the Jews unbounded was the intensity of family ties and affections. The bond between parent and child, and the conjugal relation, were alike sacred and exalted, prompting to efforts and sacrifices the most sublime. The exclusion from society, and the binding Talmudic statute, necessarily co-operated to keep the Jews removed and free from the great vices of the age. On the one hand temperance and chastity disinclining them, to excess; on the other, an entire indisposition to deeds of murder. rapine, violence, brutality, and combativeness, were deepseated qualities in the Jewish heart. If in respect of property they evinced less conscientiousness, so that they were too often prone to artifice, deceit, and over-reaching; to the circumstances of their enforced condition may this be with justice imputed, while they ever abhorred to raise their hands against the lives of their fellow-beings,

and never abandoned themselves to profligacy, and sensuality.

All this in combination, my hearers, rendered possible and effected the preservation of the Jewish race during the seventeen centuries of direst persecution, through which, after the destruction of Jerusalem, they struggled as for existence, till a new time dawned upon them, at the commencement of the last century. The position of isolation, exclusion, and repudiation, in which ever dwelt this race, rendered its amalgamation with other peoples impossible,—the Religious Idea, of which the Jewish mind held tenacious possession, whose truth had permeated the very being of this race from its first to its last member, and endowed it with resistless force and was its isolating peculiarity,—the distinctive character imprinted by Talmudism on daily existence,—the acuteness of intellect developed and kept alive in the whole mass by Talmudic studies,congregational life,—the depth and strength of family ties and affections,—the freedom from the coarsest vices and from moral depravity,—all these were, I repeat, the elements which, in combination, invested the Jewish body-politic with a resisting power, that enabled them to repel and defy the forces external to themselves, aiming at their annihilation. Thus the Jews furnish historical proof, that not only the individual man, but whole races of men, so soon as they have truth dwelling in them, cannot be subdued by any power, whether of Church or State - by any oppression, however stringent and enduring. Jewdom existed not only during the whole of the middle ages,-Jewdom not only outlived the dominion of the Roman,-Jewdom not only witnessed the fall of all peoples of antiquity, the migrations of countless races, and the irruptions of new ones,—it survived not only the rise of Christianity and Moslemism, but it still lives on to behold the dawn of a new era, the development of new social and religious mutations. It has done yet more. With this new era it was itself born to new life; an era when Judaism and Jewdom have stepped forth from their isolation and exclusion into the general world of man.

Thus the great import of these fifteen hundred centuries is this. The Christian Church sought to annihilate the Jews, and with them the antagonism to itself, of which they are the depositaries. Being unable in consequence of the dispersion, to accomplish its aim, it condemned the Jews to unmerited exclusion, of which the Roman emperors and the feudal system were the successive instruments. But the Jews overcame all obstacles to their continued existence, adhered within Talmudism to the religious idea, and arose at the dawn of a new era, towards the close of the last century, to re-enter in every relation of life the general world of man.

LECTURE X.

THE CONTENTS OF THE TALMUD.

No written utterance exists, that has been the object of more wholesale contumely or that perhaps less merits such blame, than the Talmud; nor is there any work that has been denounced with more unmitigated hatred, from the ignorance, prejudice, or servility of its denouncers. Thus much we premise, ere we proceed to pass an impartial opinion on the Talmud. In duly weighing its merits and defects, it is far from our desire or intention to present an apology for, or a panegyric on, the Talmud; but we deem it right at once to advance the above propositions, and then conscientiously and unreservedly seek to pronounce on the Talmud a just judgment.

The opponents of Judaism well knew what they were doing. They had an almost instinctive perception, that in the Talmud lay the best chance, the most powerful means of self-preservation for Judaism in the middle-ages. To condemn the one was to annihilate the other. To pronounce on the one sentence of disgrace, was to bring the other into disrepute. Even at the present day, we see that the opponents of the measures granting civil equality to the Jews, betake themselves to the Talmud, (of which they probably are wholly ignorant,) as though

the emancipation of the Jews of the middle-ages was the matter to be determined.

The Talmud, my hearers, is not a work suited for the mass of mankind; it is rather, in the aggregate, calculated to give a false bias to the mind, and its general perusal would probably be prejudicial to the mental constitution of the mass. It does not claim for itself general acceptance, like the New Testament and the Koran; on the contrary, it at once recognises that its action was not to extend without the Jewish race. Within these limits it arose, was developed, and closes. Its merits and defects were to exert an influence on that race alone. It is perfectly self-conscious that its sway is confined within the narrow boundary of Jewdom. It thence follows that the standard, and the only standard by which it can justly be measured, involves a familiar acquaintance with the degree of civilisation, the character and requirements of Jewdom, at the period of its dispersion, and of its transition into its middleage condition. One can scarcely therefore, without betraying manifest disregard for justice and historical accuracy, extract certain ambiguous passages, a few simple parables, sundry subtle deductions, tear them forcibly from the context, and then quote them as standard passages, by which the work is to be judged,or triumphantly adduce them, as incontrovertible proofs of the intolerant spirit or of the absurdity of the Talmudic writings. We will not here even insist upon the fact, that in this the Talmud could well sustain comparison with the 20,000 commentaries on the Koran, or with the numberless productions of the Church-Fathers, both of which lay claim to exercise, and have exercised, immense influence on the world of man. The merits

and defects of the Talmud are much more deeply seated than in a dozen sentences and myths. This false mode of treating the subject would be corrected by an examination of its entire constitution.

In a previous lecture* we enquired into the origin of the Talmud. We saw that it arose in the second half of the existence of the Jews as a people, (during the continuance of the second temple) at a period when Mosaism had again been received into the people's mind and heart, but at which, in some respects, its total fulfilment in practice was rendered impossible by the then altered national circumstances; at which, in others, the change wrought by time and exile in the manners and customs of those who returned, rendered Mosaism itself inadequate to meet all the exigencies of life. We saw further, that Talmudism virtually consists of an explanation of scripture. It is scripture expounded partly according to the letter, and partly according to the arbitrary notions of the expounders; so that the rational meaning of the words is not preserved, but all possible deductions from the written word, all possible inferences to be combined with that word, are therein presented. Not all these explanations, deductions, and definitions were reduced to writing; many were conveyed century after century by word of mouth from master to pupil-were therefore traditional. But the bulk of these traditional commentaries being ever on the increase, and the wider dispersion of the Jews after the fall of Jerusalem (which event deprived them of an actual central point of reunion) endangering the transmission of these verbal communications, Rabbi Jehuda Hannasi deter-

^{*} See Lecture vi.

mined, in the years after Christ 220-246, to compile a collection of the opinions and teachings of the earlier doctors. In this collection, called 'Mischna,' the dates of the authors whose names are cited do not come down lower than one century after the destruction of Jerusalem, and the age to which the anonymous passages are referred, is scarcely later than the time of the Maccabees. The work is divided into six parts. The first part, called 'Seraim,' though beginning with a long section on prayer, treats of all the laws affecting property and husbandry, of the heave offerings, the tithes, the firstlings, the gifts to the poor, etc. The second 'Moed,' treats of the laws of the sabbath, and of the fasts and festivals. The third 'Naschim,' treats of the laws of marriage and divorce, and of the unions of brothers and sisters-in-law; those also of oaths and vows are considered. The principal sections of the fourth part 'Nesikim,' treat of the civil and criminal law, of the forms of trial, of the courts of justice, and of oaths, and it has a minor section upon idolatry and witchcraft. The fifth part 'Kodaschim,' collects all the precepts and ordinances respecting cleanness and uncleanness of every kind. The sixth and last part 'Tahasoth,' treats of the sacrificial worship. This synopsis indicates a specific plan, it is true; yet must we especially observe three peculiarities as appertaining to the Mischna. 1st. No clear and distinct definitions are presented; on the contrary, varying and frequently wholly contradictory opinions of the early teachers are consecutively quoted, while no decided judgment is pronounced between them. It is, in fact, an enumeration of various replies given to one question, of which the final solution is left free and undetermined. 2nd. The treatment of these subjects, though they are specifically enumerated, is wholly devoid of arrangement; and the paragraphs are thrown together without regard to the connection between them. Besides, we observe in the Mischna that no one subject is pursued to its close, but that the most trifling incidental allusion gives rise to digressions, and that a singular jumble of heterogeneous matter every where arises; for example, in the section upon the sacrifices, many questions of civil law are considered. Thus the Mischna is essentially unsystematic and confused, and much careful and patient examination of its contents is necessary for the discovery of the parts between which connection subsists. But the third and most marked characteristic of the Mischna is, as we perceive by glancing at the above summary of its contents and at the same time recalling to our minds the circumstances of the age in which the compilation of the Mischna was effected (an age when nearly two centuries had closed above the ruins of Jerusalem,)—its most marked characteristic is, I say, that the very subjects of which it treated were no longer in existence-were matters of the past. The laws of property could not be observed in an age of dispersion. The administration of the criminal law had been wrested from the hand of the Jew, when the Romans took possession of Palestine. The sacrificial worship had necessarily ceased when the second temple fell, and with it a large portion of the hygienic laws became inoperative. Thus the only portions of the whole of the Mosaic code of which the practical fulfilment was then possible, were the laws of the sabbath, fasts and festivals, the laws of marriage and civil justice, and a part of the hygienic law, to which latter belonged the laws of diet; -so that in

fact, the larger portion of the Mischna, at the very time of its compilation, was mere matter, in part of historical interest, and in part of antiquarian research or speculation.

But in the Mischna itself, the resources of the Mischna were not exhausted; the pupils of R. Jehuda, R. Chia, and R. Oschja, compiled a very important appendix called 'Beraita,' of which several rich and lengthy fragments are still extant. Out of these writings arose fresh researches and discussions. The various conflicting opinions upon which the Mischna and Beraita had pronounced no final judgment, again gave birth to new questions, as to which were the false, which the true of these opinions. These works had besides left untouched some matters relating both to theory and practice. So again these discussions were reduced to writing as a commentary on the Mischna, and were designated as the 'Talmud'; which work received its final completion and with it its last appellation, 'Gemara,' in the sixth century. After the death of Rabbi Jehuda, two grand seats of Jewish erudition existed, one in Palestine, the other in Babylon; and consequently two Talmuds were compiled, one less voluminous and of which the greater part has been lost, the Jerusalem Talmud; the second and more complete work, called either the Babylonian or oftener simply 'the Talmud.' The Mischna therefore was the text, the Talmud the commentary; the latter was divided under the same heads and has the same general plan as the Mischna, though it far exceeds its model in the chaotic treatment of its subjects, and is wholly devoid of plan and arrangement. The Talmud is a work whose process of elaboration lasted through seven entire centuries. The teachers of the Mischna were entirely independent and self-relying in their researches, copied no models, and expressed their own opinions—opinions wholly unsuggested by others. The Talmud teachers on the contrary were bound to the Mischna, merely asserting their independence in matters of which the Mischna had omitted the investigation, or in cases in which Mischnaic opinions needed more precise definitions.

With the termination of the Talmud, this self-reliance of Jewish polemical writers ceased; and it was not subsequently deemed allowable to advance any opinion not in strict conformity with those of the Mischna, Beraita, and Talmud. At this juncture begins 'Rabbinism,' whose development assumed four distinct phases.—1st. It sought to reduce the unsystematic, ill-arranged discussions and controversies of which the Talmud is composed, into a systematic statement of the binding and authentic statutes; and this, Alfosi in the 11th, Maimonides in the 12th, Semas in the 13th, Sur in the 14th, and, finally, the Schulchan Aruch in the 16th centuries, consecutively and successfully accomplished. 2nd. Rabbinism produced numberless commentaries, either on the whole or on a part of the Mischna. 3rd. It aimed at the condensation of the explanations, which the Talmud conveys in innumerable responses.* And 4thly, it sought to explain away, or to harmonise by subtle and sophistical arguments, + the innumerable contradictions and discrepancies with which the Talmud and its commentators, particularly Maimonides, are replete.

This intellectual system had two marked results. It

established an extended and accepted dominion, which (though its boundary line was clearly defined) exercised undisputed and unrestricted rule over Judaism, down to the middle of the last century. Its second result was the opening of a vast field of literature, a portion of whose fruits was multiplied by the press, while the rest still lies hidden in manuscripts on the neglected shelves of the library.

The remaining parts of the sacred writings had been at the same early period subjected to the like process of examination and amplification, though that examination and amplification were somewhat more unfettered in their character and spirit. The unshackled creations of the intellect were here put forth, under such limitations only as the national peculiarities and the general laws of morality imposed. The Agada, or to use its specific appellation, the Midrasch, thus spontaneously resolved itself into the 'Mashal.' In it parables, allegories, and allusions were combined and amalgamated with historical truths; and to these were superadded traditions and legends. The inherent oriental genius of the people had therein wider scope; and the full tide of myths, gnomes and poesy, gushed freely forth. The greater part of this Midrasch has been lost, having been partly destroyed by the vicissitudes of time, partly having disappeared in the collection of extracts-Jalkut Schimeoni. The Midrasch subsequently assumed two successive forms, the first being the irregular 'Drash,' or lecture of the 'Magidim'; the second, the regular sermon of the present century.

Although therefore, by far the larger portion of the Talmudic discussions had no relation whatever to existing realities, and were either merely incidental to the study of scripture or to the desire for consistency, yet do we clearly perceive, that the Jews sought and found in the Talmud in some sort a new intellectual Palestine, which afforded them partial compensation for the true Palestine they had lost. This abstract land of promise possessed the one great advantage; that the dweller therein could remain undisturbed by the neighbouring foe; that of its treasures he could not be deprived, and that he could carry it with him in all his wanderings. The more cruel the persecutions that broke in upon the Jew from without, the more deeply did he feel the spiritual elevation which a withdrawal into the dominion of this abstract Talmudic Palestine afforded him. In that land of dreams the temple stood unscathed, the great assembly of the sages uninvaded - in that land the examination of the most minute point of controversy was invested with the same importance as a negociation of which the issue had involved the fate of the whole people. In that land the despised Jew found renown and acceptance, the persecuted Hebrew consolation and spiritual refreshment. How then can we wonder that the Talmud became the object of such profound and general reverence throughout Jewdom? It was a free utterance of the people, not of any sect or of any class; for its authors were children of the people, and for the people the Talmud, with all its peculiarities, was elaborated. It betrays no fancy; it has at most some extravagancies, and a few images taken from the simplest forms, but no poetic flights. In it we find sound and significant aphorisms, but no sublime and elevating words of consolation; and yet was it the city of refuge, the asylum of the way-worn Jew during 1500 years. And

wherefore? Because it furnished occupation for the thoughts, and by means of its hair-splitting distinctions, gave acuteness to the intellect, and thus administered alike intellectual and religious nourishment. Of such labour the human mind does not weary. Such being the conditions of its formation, the occasional admixture of some repulsive phrases ought not to be matter of grave and general reproach to the Talmud, since they are the utterances of some individual writer; and are amply counterbalanced by a hundred healthy and sound axioms breathing the spirit of kind-liness and justice, furnished by other contributors. We must in fine, in passing judgment on the Talmud, endeavour to penetrate the depth of the whole system and its true fundamental idea.

The less I deem myself at liberty to wander amid the mazes into which a detailed delineation of the whole of the Talmudic civil and ritual law would conduct me, the more imperative on me does it become to endeavour to place before you, my hearers, a clear conception of the leading tenets of the Talmudic system. Of these there are two; the first that pertains to the past, the second to the future. The Talmudic fundamental principle as to the past is-the preservation of Mosaism in its complete integrity; -that for the future, the belief in the Messiah. Talmudism did not, like the Koran and the New Testament, proclaim itself to be a new revelation, by which Mosaism was to be superseded. It claimed to be but an exposition and interpretation of Mosaism, a circumvallation of Mosaism with conservative enactments, in the centre of which, I repeat. Mosaism was to be maintained in its entire integrity. Though the development which it imparted to Mosaism

was wholly directed to its outward form and not to its inward spirit, so that the rank weeds of the former choked up the growth of the latter; though Talmudism and its results led far away from the religious idea; still Mosaism, and within Mosaism the pure Divine Idea, remained as a germ, imbued with undiminished vitality, waiting a resuscitation, to be imparted by the indwelling force of that Idea itself.

Christianity and Mahomedanism had essentially modified the religious idea, and had amalgamated it with heathen elements. Christianity and Mahomedanism had wholly destroyed the unity of the idea and the life. Talmudism did not modify the religious idea, it only surrounded it with the puerile childish extravagancies of the age. Talmudism enforced, with affecting and almost superstitious devotion, the unity of the idea and the life: as fragment after fragment of this material realization was torn asunder by a force from without, it sought to gather the scattered morsels within its fold, and to breathe into them ideal, if not real life. Talmudic conceptions and delineations of the Divinity are, it is true, crude in their Oriental simplicity. Sometimes God laments over His own dispensations, sometimes He insists on the most trivial ceremonial regulations, sometimes He discusses and teaches like a Jewish philosopher. But God is ever the one God, in His absolute unity and immateriality, ever God in His providence that ruleth all things for the good of man, ever God the revealer, who leadeth man to the knowledge of truth. In the Talmud we find no original sin, no Satan with his legions of fallen spirits, no excommunication, no conflict with unbelievers, no election, no exclusion. Talmudism adheres inflexibly to the equality of justice and right,

and to individual freedom; to justice stern and unbending in judgment, without respect of person or fortune. Entire independence of the judicial and the political authorities, open courts, verbal procedure, the very rare infliction of capital punishment,* and finally, its entire abolition; the positive claims of the needy, a systematic development of the regulations for the relief of the poor, suited to the altered necessity of the age: such are the adornments of the Talmud, which entitle it to be considered as the preserver of the Life of Mosaism. Thus Mosaism was bequeathed to modern times by the Talmud, not as a worn-out, superseded, though hitherto valuable and much-used relique of antiquity, but as the revelation of the religious idea, as the foundation of the unity of the idea and the life, as a wholly valid, liferuling, life-inspiring truth.

But the more self-conscious was Talmudism of the uncertain and fragmentary character of its tenure in reality, the more numerous were the obstacles consequent on the loss of Palestine, to the fulfilment by the Jew of the Talmudic law, the more imminent became the necessity that Talmudism should seek another fundamental principle in the Future. Prophetism had paved the way for this, since a central point of its activity was the extension of the Divine Idea to the whole human race.† Prophetism had connected the realisation of this union of mankind in the Divine Idea of a one and only God, of universal peace and love, with the people of Israel, by recognising that people as the bearers of the religious idea until it should universally prevail among

† Isaiah. So also, 5. Moses 4. 5, 6.—A.M.G.

^{*} Maccoth: the tribunal that once in seven years had instituted one capital punishment, was termed sanguinary.

men. It predicted their preparation for the fulfilment of their holy mission; their restoration after they should have been morally purified by means of the chastisement of which material vicissitudes had been the instruments. Amid the then general oppression of Jewdom and the suspension of the whole Mosaic system, Talmudism naturally seized upon the restoration of the people of Israel as the one essential and tangible point of all the doctrines of Prophetism, and enlarged upon the restoration of the Hebrew race, combining it with glowing descriptions of the renewal of their political power, and of the re-establishment of the Temple and of the sacrificial worship, as essential elements of the fulfilment of the whole law; associating therewith the advent of a human Messiah, deputed and empowered by God to be the instrument of this consummation. For Talmudism this was doubly necessary. In the first place it was compelled, in accordance with its own system, to pre-suppose the assured fulfilment of each and all of its own enactments. In the second, the condition of the Jewish race at that time obliged it to promise to that race, for self-sacrifice a reward—in place of its persecuted present, a brilliant future existence-instead of present impotency, future authority-of rejection, restoration-of scorn, highest honour. Further, the belief in the coming of the future Messiah, which prevailed throughout Talmudism, assumed the same direction here as was imparted to it by Mosaism, and all the true ramifications of Mosaism. While it taught that for the individual man the immortality of his soul was his Futurity, it taught also that for the individuality of the race of Israel was destined a compensating futurity on earth, the time of the Messiah. The constitution of the

Talmud itself will at once lead you, my hearers, to two evident conclusions; -- that it adopted, in the detailed descriptions of the Messianic age, the simple, fanciful, metaphorical, and plastic style ever peculiar to the East; and secondly, that among the several conceptions of that age which it contains, there exist numerous and important differences. The most material conception of a human Messiah and of the political restoration of the Jews, and the most ideal conception of an age in which the religious idea shall prevail universally among mankind, and in which the ceremonial law shall have been wholly abrogated, are equally to be found in the pages of the Talmud. Nay, in some passages it even goes so far as expressly to deny the prospective coming of a human Messiah, without (be it incidentally remarked) this difference of doctrine giving rise to any polemical conflict, or to any mutual imputations of heresy. So long as pure Talmudism survived and did not petrify into Rabbinism, it granted, while displaying fanatical zeal for the law, free scope to the idea.

Thus Talmudism linked itself with two worlds, stretching one hand over the Mosaic past, and with the other embracing the Messianic future; while by means of its materialised daily life, it incorporated itself with the present. Whithersoever turned the mental glance of the Jew, he descried objects, attractive, fascinating, and of overpowering interest.

Thus we recognise Talmudism to have been the preserver of the religious idea in its integrity, by means of the protective web of material ordinances which it spun around it, and which kept it (as the shell keeps the kernel) from corruption. In Talmudism, we further discern the sole means of self-maintenance left to

Jewdom during the middle ages, since it secured to the Jew in the first place an intellectual domain whence he drew support for his intellectual vitality; and secondly it stamped him with the peculiar character of its religious ceremonial, which, combined with his political position, preserved the Jew from amalgamation with other nations, and prevented his acceptance of their church system; -a system presenting a direct antagonism to the religious idea. So far the Talmud is perfeetly intelligible. But if we now enquire of the Talmud, in what way this religious idea itself was understood by its compilers, we shall at once perceive its third leading principle, which confined its utility strictly to a period (though a lengthened one) of transition, and renders it wholly inapplicable to the generality of mankind. Mosaism, while originating and proclaiming the religious idea, simultaneously adapted it in form, for the people of Israel only. It invested with a national law, suited to the idiosyncrasy of the Hebrew race, its grand principles of brotherly love, individual freedom, equality of rights and of property, and the subjection of the temporal and sensual to the dictates of the moral consciousness. The national existence of the people of Israel closed, and the form of the continued existence of that people, assumed that of a federation bound by community of race and religion. Instead of the aim of Talmudism being directed to the extraction of the Mosaic idea from the code of national laws of which the fulfilment had become impossible, and to the establishment of institutions, which should combine the two necessary conditions of being suited to the exigencies of the time, and of realising the idea of Mosaism,-it adhered closely to the letter of the law,

and transformed it, the Mosaic national code, as far as it was possible, into a law for individuals.

The measures to be taken in following this course, were twofold. First, Talmudism held fast to the fulfilment of every possible fragment of the Mosaic law, even where, by the departure from Palestine, their actuating idea and their true connection, were wholly abrogated. instance, with the cessation of sacrificial worship, the idea of the priesthood as a class must have ceased likewise; in fact, Talmudism had virtually superseded it, by the Talmudic writers' free assumption of the office of peopleteachers. Still Talmudism maintained the priestly order in full force, not only in respect of descent, but in respect of the individual and restrictive ordinances as to marriage and the burial of the dead to which the priesthood were subjected, and which were referable merely to the sacrificial service in the temple.* 2ndly. Where a Mosaic institution had fallen into complete and unavoidable desuetude, the Talmud replaced it by another that accorded with it in form but not with its idea, and made it binding on the individual, instead of the whole people. We instance in proof of this what follows. The sacrificial service had ceased, amidst which (as we have remarked in an earlier lecture) entire freedom was allowed to the individual in the matter of divine worship, but in which meanwhile the intimate national general religious connection of the whole people was embodied. Talmudism replaced the offerings by prayer, imposing certain prayers, nay more, a certain number of words of prayer, as a duty on the individual, in lieu of the prescribed amount of offerings; thus annulling personal freedom. From the smooth texture of the

^{*} According to Mosaism itself.

Mosaic national code, Talmudism and Rabbinism in succession, thus drew ligatures with which to bind the individual; attached to these other threads; and of these again, wove the thick fabric whose ample folds enveloped the whole life. All matters, from the most important to the most trivial incidents of life, were thus invested for the Jew in a certain determinate legislative form. All, all was subjected to the dominion of this law of form, from the first breath which he drew at birth, to the last which closed his career in death; without these forms retaining any real religious character or any real religious purport, except just so much as they derived from the circumstance of their fulfilment being thus legislatively considered an act of religion.

Though we have adduced repeated proofs that this direction was a historical necessity, and that by virtue of this direction Talmudism became the means by which the Divine Idea was preserved in its integrity, and by which Jewdom during its dispersion in the middle ages was enabled to survive, yet do we clearly and fully recognise the fact, that thus the Idea became subservient to the Form. In pure Talmudism, all vitality of the Idea ceased. For example, Talmudism is inimical to the explanation of the principles, the thought, in the commandments; and notwithstanding the production of the Kabbalah, in connection with the Talmud, as a fanciful mystic dogma on the one hand, and the rise and progress, on the other, of the Aristotelian philosophy of Maimonides; Talmudism remained unshaken, scarcely taking note of the existence of its rival, until the latter expiring through inanition, left it to the strong arm of the Talmudic ceremonial law to wield the sceptre unopposed. One, and only one beneficial effect thence ensued. Out of Talmudism no controversial conflict ever arose, since in it there was no idea of power enough to sustain such a contest. In the second place it followed, that all personal freedom was annulled in the enforced obedience to the ritual. The most imminent danger to life was the only condition which exonerated the follower of the Talmud from performance of the smallest ritual observance, and then only in the moment of danger and in the slightest degree.

If we now again refer to the facts deducible from our examination of this third Talmudic principle, we shall find that the chief was the extraction, from the Mosaic national code, of a law of form for the individual, in which the religious idea lay as in an inner germ, by which its general character was for a time destroyed. Talmudism thus became the exact contrast to Prophetism, since the latter extracted the ideal, the former the material portion only of Mosaism. Talmudism circumscribed material life, adapting it to Jews only. Prophetism developed the ideal conception. Thus both individually prepare the way for a fourth grand phase in which the unity of the Idea and the Life, according to the spiritual conception of Mosaism, shall again develop itself and prevail. This Talmudism admits. It recognises the future union of mankind as a bequeathed truth; but it does not demand universal acceptance of its ritual by mankind. On the contrary, it expresses the belief that its law will be no longer in force among the Hebrew race itself. Talmudism was adapted in its whole system to a transition period only, of the religious idea; it protected it with the shield of its ritual, till the latent vitality of that idea should be aroused into all its activity.

We have now, my hearers, passed through the three great historical epochs of Judaism; Mosaism, Prophetism, and Talmudism. We have recognised in Mosaism the establishment of the Religious Idea, in the unity of the idea and the life; in Prophetism the victory of the religious idea over heathenism, its instrument being the Jewish people: the separation of the idea and the life, and the development of the religious idea, being the conditions of its universal acceptance by mankind. We have further determined Talmudism to have been the preserver of the religious idea, by investing and surrounding it with a ritual of observances. We have seen that Christianity and Moslemism were meantime the disseminators of the religious idea among the human race. In the fundamental view promulgated by them they overcame heathenism; but in its development, they combined it and modified it with Heathen elements, and thus completed the separation of the Idea and the Life.

We have now my, hearers, reached modern times, the present age. It remains for us to consider our own existence in the present and in the future, in the two concluding lectures of our proposed course.

LECTURE XI.

THE MOVEMENTS OF RECENT TIMES IN ALL RELI-GIOUS DENOMINATIONS.

From the investigation we have thus far pursued in these Lectures, into the development of the Religious Idea, what are the deductions to be drawn? It has been seen that the Religious Idea was first set forth in Mosaism; taking as its foundation the oneness of the idea and the life, yet clothing itself in the reality of a national code. It has been also seen, that from this starting point it came by means of Prophetism to pervade the Jewish race; that it afterwards disseminated itself by the medium of Christianity and Islamism, among mankind, though in consequence of the existing historical conditions necessarily assuming a one-sided form. Its progress has ever been marked by two features. First, it has had periods of strife in which the Religious Idea was in conflict with the Human Idea, or Paganism; and during which therefore, unembodied in any tangible shape, it developed its abstract strength only. Of this Prophetism, when seeking to overcome Heathenism in the Jewish race itself, furnishes an example; as again the early ages of Christianity and Islamism, when the Religious Idea was to win for itself an entrance into the world of man. Then when the tendency towards the

Religious Idea began to prevail, it everywhere subsided into a fixed but one-sided form. Thus Prophetism passed into Talmudism, which while preserving the Religious Idea entire, shrouded it in a formula that repressed and fettered the idea. Talmudism therefore limited individual freedom, by deducing from the Mosaic national law a law of material life for the individual. Christianity on its side passed into dogmatism and the church; Islamism, into dogmatism and hierarchical government, that vitiating the Religious Idea with Pagan elements, sought to endue traditional interpretation with the validity of a ruling principle of life.

A fixed and thence from historical necessity an imperfect form, presupposes coming periods of struggle in which old and worn-out formulas will be superseded by new spiritual movements. Hence, by the new direction taken by human intellect, a new era of struggle was necessarily prepared for the three great spiritual theories, Christianity, Islamism, and Talmudism, which has rendered their stability doubtful and which tends to the evolution of some new mental phase in the world of man. This age of struggle is come; in it we live and have our being. Christianity was the first subjected to these convulsive movements, because its home was amid those races of men, the races of Europe, which have always been the most accessible to intellectual activity and the especial vehicles of intellectual progress. Then followed Talmudism in such parts of Jewdom as had become European. It is true, that in consequence of the complete social exclusion and spiritual isolation of the Jews, Talmudism stood unmoved, much longer (full 300 years longer) than Christianity. But as soon as the exclusion and isolation of the European Jews were disturbed, the prevailing intellectual movement forced the combat into the very camp of Talmudism. Islamism lastly remains unchanged up to the present day. The Asiatic knows nought of a gradually and slowly developed intellectual progress—he knows only storm and calm; no thunder-cloud has as yet burst on the Eastern world. There are indeed different and very hostile sects in Islamism; but these came into existence soon after the rise of Islamism itself, and have ever since remained unaltered.

The movements and conflicts within the pale of Christianity and Talmudic-Judaism, their several epochs and their respective imports, are what we now have exclusively to consider.

This is not the place in which to trace the course of events, that from the middle of the fourteenth to the sixteenth century caused the mind of Europe to awaken from the dull sleep of the middle ages, and to shake off the incubus that had oppressed it. These causes existed, as ever, both within and without. The revived study of Greek and Roman antiquity, a knowledge of nature in its various branches induced by the extension of navigation and commerce, the discovery of America, and some important inventions, had given the impulse; and the state of philosophy, just preparing to emerge from dry scholasticism into a new phase, produced the internal momentum. The external causes were two: the conflict between Church and State now pressing towards a decision, and the condition of society struggling to free itself on the one hand from feudalism, and on the other from absolute monarchical rule, by means of constitutional government. The new movement succumbed at its commencement to the force of existing institutions and authorities, as the Spanish Inquisition and the Council of Constance testify; but by means of its very reverses it gained strength, and took root in the hearts of the people. The Reformation, attacking Catholicism in its extreme points, such as the sale of indulgences etc., was victoriously achieved; Christianity had shaped itself into three powers, namely, dogma, church and formula. As regards dogma, the unity of God had resolved itself into the Trinity; the creation of man in the image of God, into the doctrine of original sin; the possibility of sin, into Satan the principle of evil; the direct relation of God to man, into the redemption of man through the human death of the one Divine Being incarnated. Religious knowledge was replaced by faith; love, by the election of believers. The church had raised itself above the community, and had placed in opposition to the laity, a priesthood as the vehicle of the Divine Spirit; and to all state authorities, a hierarchy, at whose head was elevated a visible representative of God on earth, invested in the person of an infallible Pope with authority to bind and to loose, with undisputed religious sway over the bodies as over the spirits of believers. The formula had embodied hypocrisy, and had substituted the adoration of saints, images, and relics, the remission of sin and a multitude of symbolic ceremonies, for heartfelt, inward piety and devotion.

Let us now examine the significance of the Reformation. It began with the sixteenth century, and employed as its instruments of success, bitter and sanguinary conflicts. The Reformation, when historically established, laid low the Church and its ceremonial,

but left the dogma untouched, or rather by means of the full development of so-called symbols, for the first time invested that dogma with a fixed and determinate form. The Reformation of the sixteenth century in its essential purport, was far more a social than a religious reformation. The oppressive power of the Church had to be destroyed, and with it necessarily fell the ecclesiastical formula. Necessarily too, the Reformation, for the sake of contrast, gave to dogma increased prominence. Again we see, that as soon as the struggle had taken a decisive turn, a distinct character manifested itself; and this was severe dogmatic form. Hence we perceive, that from its very commencement, either the Reformation called the state · authorities to its aid, or the Government claimed the Reformation as their own; that soon were formed evangelical states and Catholic states; that these states took up arms against each other; and that it was not the power of intellect, but the chances of war, by which the extent of the Reformation was determined. This was the more natural as the Reformation took place at a period of social agitation, during which the feudal system in its decline and fall had resolved itself into the absolute sovereignty of the reigning princes. Hence we see, that the first reformers bound themselves to symbols and to creeds worded with stringent exactness, and that after the Reformation, the strictest dogmatism wielded its barren sceptre.

The same causes operated, even in those very countries where the Reformation had fought and conquered, to render the victory over the Church and its formula but a partial one. For, in the place of the Catholic, or Church-Universal, was erected the national Church,

based on dogmas and symbols. In the place of the chief Bishop or Pope, we find the Sovereign Prince, or in his default the consistory; instead of the consecrated priests, ordained clergy; and in lieu of a gorgeous ceremonial, certain sacraments which were held to pertain to the very essence of Christianity. From all this it is evident, that by means of the Reformation the Religious Idea gained merely outward although important advantages, and had encountered a fresh antagonism in the dogmatism of that Reformation itself.

But the severe dogmatic character of the Reformation, necessarily in itself became the condition of a new struggle, the more inevitable because at this time, in the seventeenth century, the intellectual movement experienced a much briefer interval of repose, and at the beginning of the eighteenth century received a most powerful impetus. This rigid dogmatism it was, that first called forth its opposite extremes scepticism and materialism, developed in the last century, as is well known, into dilettantism, in the writings of Voltaire and those of his followers the Encyclopedists. The more unsatisfactory these were felt to be, the sooner did they pave the way to what has been termed rationalism, which by means of the Kantean philosophy gained ground rapidly and invaded the territory of the Christian religion. Again here, we must not overlook the great social movement which was going on at the same period. During the second part of the last and the first of the present century, absolute government was struggling with constitutional government. In like manner, there were and are active the desire and the attempts of rationalism to overcome the dogmatism of the Reformation, to substitute for the state church, an

independent free church, for the consistory, Presbyterian assemblies and congregational church-government, and to declare the sacraments mere form. Rationalism itself has lived through a twofold period; the first which was merely an analytical criticism of dogma; the second and present period marked by the efforts to combine out of the elements left after this critical analysis, something new and determinate, something more humanizing and gentle in its character and in its mental influence. Allow me, my hearers, to endeavour to make this somewhat clearer.

It has been seen that Christianity was combined out of these antagonistic elements, of which the historical causes have been elucidated in their proper place. Christianity adopted from the Mosaic precepts as the universal principle of morals, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," making love the life-principle of the human being. Yet it simultaneously renounced all influence over human society in its collective form. While Mosaism comprehended this love to our neighbour to be a declaration of equal rights to all men members of the national polity, Christianity being a subjective religion, only enforced unconditional submission, under every governmental and constitutional form of society. This introduced the first contradiction into the Christian system; for the whole of society, as it has existed from the origin of Christianity up to the present day, has been the complete reverse of that moral axiom; and I do not hesitate to assert, that the precept, "Love thy neighbour as thyself," throughout the whole of the middle ages up to the present time, has been one monstrous falsehood. Christianity adopted from Mosaism the unity of the Divine Being, but so

modified its clear attestation, that Christianity became a mystery and took its stand thenceforth on that which is the opposite of actual knowledge-faith. All the specific doctrines of Christianity are opposed to reason, and are consequently obliged, in order to maintain their ground, to deny the sufficiency and the rights of reason. Christianity aimed at the destruction of Paganism; yet it taught a trinity of the Divine Being and an incarnation of the Godhead. It sought to abnegate the heathen notion of fate; yet it replaced it by another sort of fate, the doctrine of original sin, and of belief to which mankind must be subject. Christianity sought also to rescind Jewish ceremonial; yet substituted for it another ceremonial, baptisms, communion, the mass, liturgies, fasts, etc. Thus into Christianity were introduced many inconsistencies; to reconcile which and to secure their continued existence, it became necessary to set aside human reason, or in other words their own agreement with the whole organization of the human mind, and to assert Christianity to be a third revealed fact. Accordingly, so soon as reason acquired such a preponderance in the developed intellect of man as to be no longer ignored, all the irreconcilable inconsistencies of Christianity became apparent, and the original elements adopted by it from the Religious Idea, were seen to be in direct contradiction to the modifications evolved in its historical progress. What course did this impose on its followers? When any great and widelyspread institution has reached the point at which all its contradictions and incongruities come to be displayed to the world's view, recourse is had to a solution in which three contradictions are ever apparent; and three parties always hold their ground on the great battlefield. One party endeavours to uphold at all costs that which is, and to set aside all innovation; this one has on its side all the powers appertaining to the institution, so far as it still predominates. The second party is desirous of yielding at once to the attack, and of permitting the total subversion of an institution that has lost its unity and position. On its side it has the strength and prestige of a new and powerful intellectual movement; opposed to it, not only the existing state of things, but also the great mass of the people, prone ever to remain in a condition of repose and neutrality. Lastly, the third party is composed of those who recognise the inconsistencies of the institution as a whole, yet wish to preserve such portions of it as can be retained, in order not to endanger their own tranquillity and safety. The first and second parties know exactly what they seek; while this third or middle party, having no clear consciousness, are ever trimming and wavering, inclining first to one side then to the other and splitting at length into several parties, according as their views approach more or less to the one or the other of the two above described.

This, my hearers, is the picture of Protestantism at the present day. The first or orthodox party, upholding the rigid dogmatism of the Reformation in its fullest extent and holding fast to existing institutions as the only true Christianity, reject reason as uncalled for and incompetent to the criticism of this divine revelation. They further assume themselves and claim to be, the national church, and call as such, the state to their aid. The second party are directly opposed to this system and reject everything that reason does not bring as true to their convictions and

entire consciousness. Hence they set aside all historical Christianity as untrue and inconsistent with reason, and seek to substitute for it their self-attained convictions and the general consciousness of mankind. Finally, the third or middle party select from out of historical Christianity certain fundamental elements, declare them to be true Christianity, and so far as reason can accept it in the elements thus selected by them, endeavour to uphold this Christianity.

On closer examination, we find that the first or orthodox party is the only one which has a fixed wellordered basis; but its adversary Reason has acquired so vast a preponderance in every other department of human affairs, that by the exercise of arbitrary power alone, can it be excluded from the domain of religion. Orthodoxy is truth to those only who still retain a child-like simplicity of intellect. Those only whose whole life is passed in a condition of continued intellectual childhood, can be really satisfied with orthodoxy. The more developed man either forces himself back to this position, for the sake of the peace which he has not the energy to seek for elsewhere, or adheres to it from obstinacy or in pursuit of worldly advantage. In the first case he is honest, albeit somewhat egotistical in his nature; in the second, he is a hypocrite.

The second or anti-Christian party possesses a clearly defined knowledge of its own ends, but has no determined basis of operation. It is directly opposed to the historical party, of which it desires to achieve the annihilation. It acknowledges no authority and no revelation; it insists on the self-origin of all convictions and on according to these convictions full weight, even in the religious community. This is the institution

termed free congregations; but in this also the elements of dissension are present. For whither must the system of this party lead if perfectly consistent with itself? Manifestly to a return to the human idea, -to Heathenism, though necessarily and evidently to a modern Heathenism. For whereas ancient Heathenism saw warring principles in nature, and thence deduced the plurality of the gods, Man in recent ages has learnt to look on nature as a whole, and hence to recognise the God whom she discloses to him, to be One God, a Unity. The most important point is however that the view he takes of the Godhead in nature, is identical with that held by the heathenism of old. God and nature with him are one and the same thing; whereas the Religious Idea teaches us that God is supermundane, and that nature is the work of God. Setting forth from this principle, the inevitable sequence is that man being the highest organism, full validity will be restored to the motive principle of selfishness; love, justice, purity and morality will lose their foundation in God, in whom the Religious Idea places them, and will become mere relative conditions and aspects of man's being in regard to himself. It is but recently that this has for the first time been openly avowed as the basis of a religious system, by the 'Marbourg Friends of Light,' a body which though scattered, is more numerous than it is supposed to be. Another large party, repelled by the comfortless character of these views, stop half-way on a path in the same direction, and profess Deism, that is the God of the Religious Idea, while they refuse to be indebted to history for their knowledge of Him, and declare that knowledge to be a native growth of their own minds. These, however, want a firmer foundation

for their system. They accept nothing that is not proved. Yet they take for granted as proved, that which is not susceptible of proof, (as Kant shows) and then impute to it the same validity as though it had been demonstrated. Besides, to combine the complete sufficiency of individual conviction with any universal doctrine is per se a contradiction, since the right of private judgment assumes the severing of the general bond of a common belief. Here then as well as in the orthodox party, we encounter elements arbitrarily combined.

We come lastly to the third and middle party, those who chose to remain Christians yet reject historical Christianity. In their system also, a weak point may be found; that point is the absence of any fixed and determinate standard. They aim at separating from historical Christianity, so much as they deem to be true. But what is their ground, what is their measure of acceptance or rejection? The ground and measure are the Scriptures, they reply; that is, the New Testament. But the New Testament as a whole furnishes the materials of all the Christian doctrines. Dogmatism has its entire foundation in the New Testament. This being an accepted fact, the phrase so constantly employed, 'The Scriptures according to the spirit, not according to the letter,' are words without meaning. For either I put into them whatever my mind is compelled or wills to find in them, or I leave out whatever my mind is compelled or wills to reject. Both these operations transform the Scriptures into something I have willed them to be; and thus all becomes individual. My idiosyncrasy comes therefore to be my motive principle, and not the Scriptures; and to the whole system is thus given the instability of a mere delusion. Finally,

another course is to seek a primitive or original Christianity; the later writings, the Gospel of St. John and the Epistles are severed from the New Testament the more ancient portions only being retained, in order to establish this primitive Christianity. But where, as a historical truth, is this primitive Christianity to be found? At its rise out of Judaism; for tracing the course of Christianity back to its source, we arrive at Judaism as it existed in Mosaism and Prophetism. But there too at the point where Christianity flows out of Judaism, we have already recognised that severance of the Here from the Hereafter, that breach between the Idea and the Life, that sacrificing of the Present to the Future, in which assuredly truth whole and entire cannot be comprehended. We are therefore compelled to further retrace our steps, until we reach Mosaism. Again here, be it observed, the arbitrary assumption of the individual determines both the ground and the measure, and a halting point is sought on a road on which it is not to be found. This is just what we perceive to be actually the case among the 'Protestant Rationalists' and 'Friends of Light.' These two sects have the merit of asserting the rights of reason as opposed to orthodoxy; they have further the merit of desiring to protect the Religious Idea against the assaults of Pantheism. But with these negative services they have never been able to combine any positive benefits, the specific one excepted, of maintaining the rights of the community in opposition to the encroachments of State Churches.

Upon these movements a fresh one has recently supervened, on a territory which had hitherto remained unshaken by mutations, that of Roman Catholicism. While it was really Protestantism that fought the battle

above described, it is nevertheless certain that very many individuals, though for various and manifold reasons nominally remaining within the pale of Roman Catholicism, were not uninfluenced by the movements around. As at the time of the reformation, a number of Catholics separated themselves from orthodox Catholicism, and attacking one of its extreme doctrines, the adoration of the coat,* abandoned the ranks of the church and formed themselves into a new community. The movement was rapid, the agitation it produced spread rapidly, and was rapidly brought under certain regulation and control. But as rapidly was it outwardly checked, and confined within prescribed limits. It must here be observed that it doubtlessly gained most ground in those parts of Germany where Protestantism chiefly prevailed. It is vain to object that its progress was forcibly arrested by state authorities. For in the first place, in several Protestant countries even, it had to overcome the hostility of the respective Governments; and in the second, when, we would ask, was ever any religious movement suppressed by the exercise of political power, if it had deeply imbued and extensively pervaded the mind of the masses of the people? Never! On German Catholicism this good fortune attended not. And wherefore? The development of the Protestant struggle was naturally progressive, and its instruments were therefore always ready prepared and available for immediate use. The road from Catholicism to dogmatism, from dogmatism to rationalism, from rationalism to the Free Communities and the 'Friends of Light,' is one definite onward path. Now German Catholicism

^{*} A relic whose periodical exhibition attracts numerous pilgrims to Treves.—A.M.G.

had to overstep this development, and found in the Catholic mass very little prepared material. Here then was their first stumbling-block. Again the German Catholics, like the reformers of old, were precipitately urged on to decide at once on their future course. Was it not then probable that they would fall into one of the phases of Protestantism? And into which? A form as elastic as possible was therefore sought which should admit within its limits the greatest possible number of individual sympathies, and in which should be preserved something of the old Catholicism in a modern dress. But this proved another stumbling block. For the mass of mankind require something tangible, something that they can grasp and hold by; they want not to seek but at once to find. So, as was inevitable, no members of the Catholic Church gave in their adhesion to the new community, except such as had long previously had a Protestant bias. And very few of the Protestant party joined it, since they found it nothing more than what they already possessed. German Protestantism, it is true, endeavoured to gain a certain footing by means of a more outward elaboration. It aimed, as its name implies, at uniting in one universal German Church, all those who had outgrown Catholicism and Protestant orthodoxy. But under existing circumstances this great idea could not be carried into effect. The age is as yet unprepared for the realisation of a task, which is in truth the mission of Protestantism itself.

What is then the result of the whole Christian development, from the Reformation to the present time? It is this; that reason has made good its claims against dogmatism and has separated from it the specific

elements of Christianity. Hence results again a two-fold effort; on the one hand has been attempted the re-edification of the Religious Idea divested of its specifically Christian elements, by the 'Friends of Light;' on the other, the 'Free Communities' have dissolved all common bond of union, by establishing the validity of private judgment or individual reason; and thence has been evolved its extreme result—Pantheism or modern Heathenism.

Let us now direct our attention to the movements which have taken place within Judaism, of which we must date the commencement from the middle of the last century. In so doing, we at once bring into strong relief two distinct and characteristic features, that necessarily and essentially distinguish the Jewish from the Christian movement. First, in Judaism there has been no controversy as to doctrine; the relative obligation of observance of the ceremonial law or of adherence to the idea, forms the chief ground of debate. 2ndly. The change produced by the social movement was necessarily, within Judaism, far more decisive, and effected a far more marked transformation. For the social and religious movements of Christianity proceeded simultaneously, were the outpourings of one and the same spirit; but in those of Judaism, the social element was in itself the primary cause, and became in fact the umpire in the dispute. These two characteristics have a close mutual connection; for the social movement met a decided obstacle in the Talmudic ceremonial, which it had to break through and which it has in fact brought into desuetude; a task it had in a great measure achieved, while the intellectual movement remained yet undecided.

We have seen viz., that Talmudism preserved the whole of the Religious Idea as Mosaism and Prophetism had handed it down, but hedged it round with an extensive ceremonial; weaving at the same time out of the Mosaic national law a law of material life for the individual, by which the Idea was thrust into the background and individual freedom annulled. To this ceremonial, Talmudism attributed imperative sway, partly by referring it to the Scriptures, partly by declaring it to be a traditional interpretation handed down orally from Moses himself, and partly in fine by asserting the claim of the Talmudic teachers to absolute and uncontested authority.

It was during the first half of the last century that the first rays of light fell on the benighted isolation of the Jews. The dissemination of these stray beams was aided, by the position of some among them as members of the medical profession. Then the intellectual culture of the Jews increased both within and without, with almost magical rapidity. Mendelssohn became as it were, the type of Jewish cultivation. He, the son of a Jewish scribe, brought up in the midst of Talmudism, instructed only in Hebrew lore, attracted, ere many years had elapsed, the attention of the whole world of letters by the fluent, sweet, and elegant style in which his learned and instructive works were composed; works conceived in the spirit of the Grecian writers, and subsequently translated into all living languages. What was at that time the attribute of few Jewish intellects, became in the course of the century, the universal property of the Jewish mass, thereby raising the whole of the next generation to the intellectual European standard, and consequently far above and

beyond the domain of Talmudism. This intellectual cultivation could not fail to re-awaken the Idea, and to cause the right of private judgment and the claims of individual freedom, in opposition to Talmudism, to be fully recognised.

But at the same period viz., the latter half of the last century, came to pass that revolution in municipal society which transformed absolute into constitutional government. This was not a change in social forms merely, but in society itself. The state ceased to be expressed by the person of the monarch alone, (l'état c'est moi) and extended itself to every part of the social edifice. The state became an organism, to which all its members belonged equally as integral parts. For all those members, the ground-work of the state thus became one universal rule of right. Among the rest, the Jew quitted his isolated position, and was incorporated with the state. As one of its members, he lost the miserable privileges granted to him in the exercise of usury and hawking, and inherited all the duties belonging to a member of the state and with them all the rights appertaining to such members. Hence as this view of national existence became general, its application to the Jews could not long remain disregarded. If to *Germany belongs the merit of having first given it written utterance, (Dohm, 1781) it was North America, 1785, and Holland, 1796, that first carried the principle into practice, and placed the Jews as citizens, in a position of perfect civil and legal equality with the members of all other religious denominations.

The attainment by the Jews to a like condition

^{*} Alas! that to this time it should have in Germany remained for the most part, a theory devoid of fulfilment.—A. M. G.

has been in the other countries of Europe a matter far more difficult; in them the progress of emancipation has been gradual. Prussia conceded some very unimportant municipal rights in 1812 and has since withdrawn them. Denmark followed the example in 1814 by more extensive grants. That equality which was established by the French in Westphalia and Italy, was subsequently partially rescinded in the former; wholly in the latter of these states. Hesse-Cassel is now the only place in Germany where the Jews are legally on the same footing with other communities. In the other German states a varving scale of freedom has been adopted. In Bavaria and Austria,* the condition of the Jews is yet marked by many exceptional laws. In Poland and Russia the mediæval state of the law has not vet yielded to the intelligence of the age. In Mahomedan countries the position of the Israelites has remained unchanged for centuries.

If the Jews have legally taken their place in the civil community, they have done so far more socially. The particular callings to which they had been exclusively condemned, have been abandoned by them: every branch of trade, commerce, science and art, has been opened to them, while in each succeeding generation they have availed themselves more and more extensively of the new fields thus granted to their activity and intelligence. And as during the past thirty years of peace commerce and industry have undergone a complete revolution, and the spirit of castes and corporations has gradually

^{*} Under the paternal government of Austria the Jews are yet subjected to vexatious laws, bootless and cruel restrictions, which in their spirit are worthy of the darkest of the middle ages.—A. M. G.

died away, so have the Jews been led on further and further into these new phases of life. The more clearly impossible it was to arrest this onward course, the more the necessity or the desire of self-maintenance impelled him forward who had once entered on it, the sooner did the Jew find an obstacle arise to the pursuits of his daily life, in the requirements of the Talmudic ceremonial. ceremonial law, especially calculated for an isolated and retired existence, could not in many cases be made to agree with a life merged in the pursuit of worldly gain and the duties of citizenship. To such a life it was opposed. Numerous individuals were soon carried by the force of the current over this Talmudic dyke. Thus two great causes operated to cause the Jews to demur as to Talmudic Judaism. Their intellectual cultivation, which infused new vitality into the Idea, awakened their sense of right to liberty of thought and to individual free agency, and their social life imbued them with a desire to break through the Talmudic ceremonial law, by which that life was so trammelled.

Long did this contradiction exist, long did these elements of strife operate, before the mental struggle gave outward signs of its inward being. Existing authorities that had remained unshaken and inviolate as the ruling power, during fifteen hundred years, and the indifference towards religious matters necessarily resulting from the latent contradictions,—an indifference which carried religious earnestness and religious needs and aspirations, to an alarming extent, without and beyond the pale of the Jewish community, caused the actual inward strife to be hushed up, the discrepancies to be concealed by silence. Individuals sought to regulate their religious practices according to their own

convenience, a process the more easy, since the doctrine of Judaism was never subjected to any open attack.

This state of things could not long continue. The extended mental cultivation, itself generated the requirement for the more earnest working out and solution of the religious problem. The first opportunity was afforded by the mode of religious worship, which retaining the form it had received in the middle ages, denied all satisfaction to the improved taste and the refined feelings of the present age. This controversy arose twenty years ago and is only now approaching to an issue. Yet this strife about the worship, like that of the Reformation, refers only to outward forms. The history of Jewish worship lies pretty clearly before us. To the Mosaic revelation it has no relation, since in the Law of Moses no specific form of worship is prescribed. Nor did it institute any form of divine service for the individual. The question therefore respecting worship, was not a question of principles; the attack was directed not against law, but against custom; it took place in fact on neutral ground. But it soon gave rise to a second question as to the obligatory force of customs unconnected with divine worship. Upon this a third question speedily supervened, a question as to the compulsory and binding character of the Talmudic law. History was appealed to, and by it the alleged uninterrupted oral tradition from Moses down to the writers, of the Mischna and Gemara, was not established; on the contrary, it was disproved. The Talmudic law therefore could claim no decided authority, excepting so far as it is confirmed by the Scriptures. But the Talmudic interpretation is a free interpretation, without regard to the rational sense of the sacred text. Here-

upon arose the fourth question. Moses laid down certain general principles, the principles of the Religious Idea and the religious life; these he immediately embodied in a code for the nation and the state; but the nation and the state no longer exist. The greater portion of this national and state law, lost its actuality when the nation lost its independence. Now the greater the truth indwelling in the general principles embodied in the national and state laws when consistently developed, the sooner arises the inquiry: 'Is the extant portion of the Mosaic national law, which became by the overthrow of the Jewish national life a mere dead letter, still binding in its literal acceptation'? Or does it stand in so integral a connection with the whole, that both it, and the rest of the code, have lost their unconditional validity in real life? For instance, it is asked, Were the dietetic laws of Moses only a part of the law of sacrifice and purification, so that they have lost their value with the present non-application of that law, or have they so important and independent a significance, that the Jew of the present day should consider them as binding? Have they or have they not, like the sprinkling the water of purification after contact with a dead body, only a symbolical, devotional character?

Such have been and are still the questions, that have arisen among the Jews and have taken a character more or less prominent, according as they refer to matters more or less important; for example, the question as to the laws for the Sabbath, and the customs relating to the day of mourning. From all this collectively considered, results this particular and essential inquiry: How far is the Mosaic-Talmudic-ceremonial law binding on us, in our present condition of intellectual

and social development? And from these elements came into existence in Judaism also, different parties respectively formed of individuals holding and professing certain shades of opinion. These parties may be thus described. First, there are the orthodox Talmudists, who insist on upholding the binding force of the Talmudic law entire and the unconditional authority of the Talmud. This party is again divided into two sections, one enforcing a literal fulfilment of the laws of the Talmud according to the signification of the Rabbins; the other and smaller section, while inclining to the Idea, seek a new ingenious and artificial foundation for the Talmudic law. Secondly, The Reformers, who refuse to the Talmud, not only all authority but all value, set the ceremonial entirely aside, and insist on the recognition of individual freedom as the first and highest of all principles. This party are likewise devoid of a consistent foundation for the theory they would establish; for they deny at once, all that was established by Mosaism as an essential element, viz. the union of the idea and the life. They in fact elevate themselves above Mosaism, and adhere only to an arbitrary interpretation of Prophetism. The ground on which they thus place themselves affording no firm footing, in the extremes of this party has naturally been betraved a tendency towards modern Paganism or Pantheism, leading them directly away from and out of, the Religious Idea. Thirdly, midway between these two, is the so-called moderate party, which might more justly be termed the historical party. Their specific purport and aim are, the upholding of Judaism as the special vehicle of the Religious Idea. They desire on the one hand, the development and elevation of the Religious Idea; on the other the maintenance,

as far as is possible under the circumstances of these times, of the historical form of Judaism. According to their view, the ceremonial law has no real and absolute value, but is to be upheld as the means of preserving the independence of Judaism, by combining with it the antagonism to its surroundings. How important soever this party may be in the present time, they are seen to be ever involved, for want of an abstract principle, in internal contests. For if subservience to the age, which must always coerce them to fresh concessions, is to be their leading principle, what they hold fast to-day, to-morrow they will find escaping from their grasp. Each day they would fain cry, 'Halt!' but the halt is ever being further postponed.*

I have thus, my friends, endeavoured to give you an impartial sketch of the condition of the age and of the

^{*} It may perhaps be desirable to state for the information of the non-Jewish reader, that the congregation of British Jews to whom the designation of 'Reformers' has been applied by their brethren in this country, are not identical either in the principles they profess, or in their practice, with any one of the parties described above by our author. Their principles are, unconditional belief in the divine inspiration of Moses and the Prophets, and of them only; in the duty of obedience as unconditional to the whole moral code of Moses, and to all the laws which admit of individual observance, and which are not by their very nature and by Moses himself, restricted in their fufilment to the existence of the Israelites as a nation, to the soil of Palestine, and to the precincts of the temple. The objects the ministers and their congregants place before themselves, cannot be better defined than they are by our author in the words * 'To work out within us into clear consciousness, fixed and definite ideas of Mosaism, and to give those ideas, so far as it is possible under the conditions of our present existence, life and form; to make them actual and active, in us and among us.-A. M. G.

^{*} Lecture I., page 19.

controversies which mark it in the domains, both of Christianity and of Judaism. I must beg your indulgence, if the space of one lecture has afforded time for a mere sketch, rather than a regular and complete analysis. I have only indicated the questions and the difficulties they involve; viz. in Christianity, the restoration ultimately of the Religious Idea, without the specifically Christian elements; and in Judaism, the divesting the Religious Idea of the ceremonial law. I have shewn how in Christendom, Christianity is evolving itself into the Religious Idea predicated by Mosaism; how in Judaism the ceremonial law is merging into the Religious Idea; how in Christendom, the Religious Idea itself is still matter of debate, while in Judaism the Religious Idea is ever extant ever openly expressed, ever uncontested; but clothed in a ceremonial law which forms the subject of dispute. And lastly, I have shewn how the task of Judaism is, as it has ever been, to preserve the Religious Idea perfect and entire; and how that of Christianity is to arrive at the complete Religious Idea by the path of free, independent selfdevelopment. What is the solution of these problems? What is the future of religion? What is the goal? These questions press upon us; they rise unbidden, as the result of our previous enquiry. Assuredly, to these questions no simple and unconditional answer can be given. The child of earth cannot raise the veil of the future. Nevertheless, at the point of the world's history at which we have arrived, it may perhaps be permitted to us, when once we have taken our stand on ground above the level of parties, to derive from history some insight into that which is to come. We seek our clue in the Past, and then guided by it, pursue our onward path into the Future.

LECTURE XII.

THE FUTURE OF RELIGION.

AFTER having traversed with you, in so far as it has been permitted me, the great 'Past' of the Religious Idea, I purpose to-day, my respected hearers, directing your attention to the domain of the Future. Let me first remove everything which may become an obstacle on our onward path, which may divert the actual inquiry from its true starting-point and goal. It has been asked: - Will Judaism continue to exist? Will Christianity or the positive religions in general, endure in the future? The solution of this question has been attempted and contested by each party and confession in turn. The Christian has predicted the approaching end of Judaism. The Jew has foretold the resolution of all religions into his belief. The Moslem equally proclaims the future dominion of the Crescent over all the countries of the earth. These are not the decisions at which prejudice only arrives; they are the expression of the indwelling convictions which each respectively holds. They are also evidences of the ignorance of each, of that which fills the mental being of the others. Yet we perceive nevertheless, that the outward boundaries of each religion remain unmoved.

We see that notwithstanding the compulsion and persuasion exerted, those who do change their religion are not after all, objects of especial consideration and esteem. Besides these respective predictions of existing faiths, by which to each confession in its turn all endurance in the future has been refused, it has been foretold that a new and totally distinct religion will rise and develop itself triumphantly out of the wreck of former faiths, that we shall behold, instead of the Future of religion—the religion of the Future.

All these questions and answers may, my hearers, at least be designated as premature and illogical; they give evidence of imperfect acquaintance with the spirit of history, with the course of development of mankind, and with the ways of Divine Providence. God's providence, if I may be permitted the expression, is no charioteer that suddenly overturns the vehicle entrusted to his guidance when too heavily laden. The march of human development is no spring hither and thither, follows no zig-zag, uncertain path. As we see in nature, so we see in the grand universal progress of the world's history; that everything has its appointed place, everything is self-supporting and independent although a member of the great organism, and is gradually prepared and developed from step to step, till it reaches its highest and ultimate degree of perfectibility. According to our view therefore, the question assumes far higher import if thus framed. Will men, will all the members of the great human family, ever be united in one only religious belief, and how is the possibility of attaining this great end demonstrable? For in this question is included the result of a vast development of that which is; in it is involved, not the direct annihilation of all existing religions, but their resolution into something universal; in it is enfolded something which surpasses far the fixed knowledge and conceptions of the present time; so that we need not say, to-morrow we reach to the end of our journey, and what will ensue? In this question again, we encounter the ancient predictions of the prophets, who in an age when the dominion of the Religious Idea was limited to the smallest spot of earth, yet recognised the conquering force of that idea, and declared this to be its far distant yet ultimate goal. In this we express the desire of every friend of human-kind, who feels that the highest of all aspirations is the hope that the bond of truth will one day encircle and unite all the sons of men. But is this question in the category of human aspirations, destined ever to remain unrealised? Is it devoid of reality, having a place in the domain of Poetry alone? Or does the certain march of history show us that mankind under the action of these contrasts, long since set forth on their appointed course to this goal? So that when we are enabled to elevate ourselves above the troubled and misty atmosphere which surrounds the present, we clearly discern the path leading to that issue. This proposition it is now our task to analyse.

For its fulfilment, it will be necessary that we should bring the process of development of the human race once more clearly before us. The intellect of man generated universally and instinctively the 'Human Idea.' Making the ego the starting point, he invested the powers of nature, according as their relation to himself was pernicious or beneficial, with a higher power which exceeding his own he deemed a divinity. His views of nature determined his conceptions of the

Deity. Man in his earliest stage perceived conflict in nature, the contrasts of production and dissolution, of growth and decay, of existence and non-existence, of life and death; these again being upheld in their counter-action by a third yet incomprehensible power. In ancient heathenism, God and nature were held to be identical; and thence ensued the conception of two conflicting divinities, of a third and mediating Divine power, as also the supposed connection with every form in nature, of a special divinity. Modern heathenism is the second step, which having a similar origin yet conceives nature to be a unity. In its system, nature is a uniform whole in which all specialities neutralise or resolve each other. In this the Divinity is a unity, but identical with nature, indwelling nature and having its whole existence within nature. While in ancient heathenism the ego was the starting-point, in modern heathenism the ego is a part of the whole, and only as such member, claiming to render his existence valid; so in both the individual has no other relation to society than that founded on his individuality, (or ego) and can develop justice and morality, only in their relation to his individuality and its relation to them. So the contentment of the individual ego in the fluctuating conditions of this existence, becomes, albeit mutable and most variable, the highest object. Egotism is then the sole principle of justice and morality. This human idea first encountered the Religious Idea in Mosaism. The Religious Idea assumes the Deity to have been made known to us by revelation. It recognises the world as proceeding from Him, to be the work of God, the aggregate of all specialities, and man to be the speciality endowed with a spirit created in the image of God. God is

therefore supermundane, holy, perfect, eternal. The world is sustained by God indirectly by the laws of nature. With man God is in direct connection, since He conducts man's destiny to perfectibility, judges his actions, purifies and pardons him, and has bestowed on him the Religious Idea. Thence it becomes evident that to approximate ever more to God, to assimilate with Him, is man's destination, and that justice and morality have their immutable basis in God Himself. Man's appointed task therefore, is to render himself holy as God is holy. This sanctification manifests itself in love to God, to his fellow-man, and in the continual exercise of the moral consciousness by the human being. Thence is deducible that all men are equal, having equal rights, and that all are destined to possess individual freedom. Equal rights, all possibly equal possessions, and personal freedom in accordance with these two conditions, must form the ground-work of all human society.

These then my hearers, are the two Ideas which have come in the world of man, into violent collision. But how did this conflict arise? Not as a naked abstract dogma, but incorporated with the very life of the peoples of the earth. So that Mosaism should be for ever combined with a national code was indispensable, in order that it should under that form, imbue the Jewish people with the Religious Idea. Without its limits, the Human Idea, ancient heathenism, exercised entire sway over all the races of men, gave tangible existence to polytheism, idolatry and slavery introduced the authority of certain races, and an unstable and varying civil and state-government, as the basis of human society.

After the Religious Idea on the one hand had overcome heathenism in the Jewish race by means of Prophetism, and had by its severance of the Life and the Idea, become fitted to enter the general world of man; after heathenism on the other hand, had in the natural course of its suicidal development attained the point of dissolution; the Religious Idea ensured its own integrity by the means it employed, Talmudism and its code of material laws in Judaism; and its introduction into the world of man in Christianity and Mahomedanism; by setting forth its abstract elements only, by acquiring independent existence as the Idea severed from the Life, by rejecting the 'Here' and making the 'Hereafter' its centre of gravity, did it alone gather sufficient force firmly to take root in the general world, where it was modified by combination with elements of the Human Idea. There it not only developed dogma and the Church, but likewise permitted the action of heathenism to continue and to produce the feudal system in society, while addressing itself exclusively to the world beyond, in the individual. But after the intellectual development of mankind had recovered somewhat of energy and strength, and had opened out for itself new paths. then uprose the Religious Idea, prepared for a fresh conflict. In Christianity it first shook the sway of the Church, then re-asserted the validity of the claim of reason as opposed to dogma, and produced a new phase in society based on the principle of universal human rights, in a constitutional state-government. In Judaism, the Religious Idea rose against the binding Talmudic formula that trammelled all individual freedom of the spirit and of the intellect, it sought to re-establish the validity of the Idea and to restore it to its place, invested with

all its original and natural purity. This, my hearers, is the historical juncture at which we have arrived; this is the present. What are the conclusions as to the future, which may be drawn from this process of development? The first question is; will the Religious or the Human Idea, as we have above portrayed it, obtain empire over mankind? For notwithstanding the victorious issue of the Religious Idea, it may be advanced that the Religious Idea is only an educational means for the human race, by which to train them to self-dependence in the human idea; and that consequently all useless matter will at the right time disappear. To this the prominent objection is; 1st, that the human idea always produces with itself its own abnegation. Every explanation of birth and existence is abrogated by its antagonistic principle; every presumption of an original cause pre-supposes something that has preceded it, which proves the first to be but secondary and derivative. But in the Religious Idea there is complete congruity; for every created thing finds its origin in God the Creator. All specialities have their resolution in the absolute Being of God, all special powers their source in the universal power of of God. Secondly, we thence perceive that the Human Idea ever produces its own resolution into its various successive phases; that each of these phases too abrogates that which it followed, till it reaches its ultimate stage, the virtual disavowal of its own system. Such was its course in the religions of antiquity; in the philosophemes of the Greeks; in the later philosophemes of Des Cartes and Spinoza, as in that of Hegelism. It is a circle that ever terminates in itself, the serpent that holds its own tail in its mouth.

The valid results of this intellectual activity, are the development of the powers of thought and the ever strengthening and deepening self-consciousness of the reason-logic. But beyond this there is no result. We see that the Religious Idea on the contrary, is ever consistent, ever the same; that it outlives in their rise and fall, all the successive phases of the Human Idea, and that it displays in truth the greatest vigour, at junctures when the Human Idea is in process of resolution. On which side will be the victory, which will obtain dominion over mankind, cannot be a matter of uncertainty. The end will assuredly be that the Human Idea will eventually resolve itself into the Religious Idea, not as a lifeless, soulless acceptance, but as a living conscious amalgamation. This is a work yet to be achieved.

The second question hence follows: -In what manner will the Religious Idea manifest itself to mankind in its completeness, in its entire integrity? The Religious Idea arose in Mosaism on a Jewish-national basis, in Talmudism on a Jewish-individual basis, on a heathen basis in Christianity and Mahomedanism; Prophetism even, in proclaiming the Religious Idea to be destined one day to become the common property of all mankind, did not abandon the national ground. Under no one of these specific aspects can the Religious Idea belong to the universality of the human race. Yet has it been evident that Judaism throughout all its phases, has preserved the Religious Idea intact; that Talmudism also is but a web spun around that idea with a view to its protection; that Judaism will, after this Religious Idea shall have cast off the cocoon of individuality, deliver it over to all mankind; and in Judaism should

we seek it, in the uniformity which it will one day assume as the possession of all mankind. Let us in order to remove all doubt from our minds, remark: 1st. In the form with which historical Christianity has clothed the Religious Idea, that Idea demands faith, is opposed to reason, disallows inquiry. 2ndly: In historical Christianity, one portion only of man's nature can unite itself with the Religious Idea. Therefore is the regenerated man of Christianity ever in a state of conflict with Christianity itself. If we consider all Christian sects and parties in the aggregate, we perceive that the Religious Idea itself, is still combatted in Christianity. 3rdly. The Religious Idea within Christianity is still in a condition of inconsistency and selfconflict. It has therefore before it in Christianity, the task of self-evolution. 4thly and lastly. In Islamism. are extant the very first conceptions of the Religious Idea, which immediately and consistently lapsed into the purely heathen conception of Fate, or necessity. So that Islamism presents no development of the Religious Idea; it presents only a phase of self-annihilation.

The Religious Idea in Judaism assumes a wholly opposite direction. 1st. It appeals, not to one side of man, but to the entire human being; it appeals. not to the belief, but to reason, to actual knowledge. The Religious Idea in Judaism insists on comprehension and acceptance by means of reason; seeks by means of nature, to demonstrate itself to the understanding, seeing it contains no element susceptible of denial by the power of reason. The Religious Idea is in Judaism objective in that which pertains to the intellect, subjective in that which belongs to the heart of man. 2ndly. The Religious Idea has never been controverted by Judaism

itself; is not and has never been inconsistent with itself, or in conflict with itself. The central point of of the present struggle in Judaism is not the Religious Idea and its purport, but the binding nature of the ceremonial law on the Jews; the conflict therefore refers to that and that only, by which the Religious Idea is individualised in Judaism, and which yet separates Judaism from the rest of human society. 3rdly and lastly. Judaism has never declared itself to be in its specific forms, the religion of all mankind; but has ever asserted itself to be the religion of all mankind in and by the Religious Idea. Judaism has ever expressly said, 'My specific character, my law, my forms are destined for the sons of Israel only, as bearers of the Religious Idea; my purport, my significance, the Religious Idea itself, are for the whole race of man.' Talmudism itself admits that he even who no longer observes one law, but who utters as his confession of faith the words, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Eternal is one," may be considered still to be a Jew. With small variation may we say, 'He is to be considered a Jew, who confesses his belief in the One, only, supermundane God; not as a Jew in race but as a Jew in kind, as professing the Religious Idea as it is contained in Judaism.' Thus Judaism has claimed, not in its special character but truly in and by the Religious Idea, to be the destined portion of all mankind; while historical Christianity claims to win all men to itself in its individual form, notwithstanding its selfinconsistency and the discrepancies which it contains.

Judaism therefore, my hearers, asserts itself to be only the bearer of the Religious Idea. It does not say, 'Ye children of other creeds, ye Christians,

ye Mussulmans, ye must avow yourselves of my faith ye must become Jews.' It says on the contrary, 'The other religions that were born of me, that have modified my purport, must freely develop themselves, must resolve these their own modifications, and must by an individual process of self-enlargement, reach the final goal of that free development, the Religious Idea. Then will my special form become superfluous, then can I divest myself of my garb, for then will the whole of man be united in the knowledge and acknowledgment of the One only, supermundane, holy God, whose work the universe is, who gave unto man a soul created in His own image; who therefore stands in direct relation to man as Providence, Judge, Pardoner, Revealer: who will consecrate man unto Himself in love and moral consciousness, by means of a human society founded on the eternal principles of equality of right, all possible equality of possession, and personal freedom. Thus will the world arrive, not at the specific Judaism of the Jews as it has been; but at the Religious Idea such as Judaism through all its phases has ever borne within itself unchanged, unpolluted; though brought into the world of man by Christianity and Moslemism, in an imperfect form. In this manner all will we perceive be fulfilled, that we have seen to be indicated in history. The question as to the necessity for the continued existence of Judaism after the promulgation of Christianity and Moslemism, has been satisfactorily solved. It has become clear to us that Judaism has in the present and in the future, an allimportant mission, even that which she has ever had, to fulfil. When Christianity in its process of self-development shall have finally rejected its specific Christian

elements and shall seek a fitting basis for the Religious Idea, Judaism will be there to bestow on it that possession. For that which in Christianity is the work of free development only, of the victory of reason over dogma, will be found in Judaism alone, to be the firm foundation, the sole material for the historical superstructure. Reason will there solemnise her union with History, the acquisitions of reason will become identical with the facts of history, the result identical with the true basis of all human development. Here then the destination of Judaism to receive and to bear the Religious Idea for all mankind, meets our view in its historical completeness. It existed and was fulfilled as confronting Heathenism; it existed and exists confronting Christianity and Moslemism. The struggle which the Jews have had to maintain, first with their heathen neighbours, then with the Greek-Syrians and Romans, and finally during the last fifteen consecutive centuries in Christendom, has been maintained on behalf of the Religious Idea, its purport and scope. It has been the sublime conflict of the Religious Idea with its antagonisms. The inflexible pertinacity with which the Jews have remained stedfast to their faith is not obstinacy; it is more, it is the most meritorious fidelity, an inward necessity: for man cannot renounce the complete Religious Idea, in order to apply himself to, and accept it in, its modifications. Judaism and its professors the Jews, must continue to exist till the conflict within Christianity itself shall be decided, and till the victory over the antagonisms to itself within Christianity, shall have been achieved by the Religious Idea in its entireness and purity.

But, my respected hearers, after having thus treated

of a union of mankind in the Religious Idea, we must not overlook another essential point. If truly in the great battle-field of life and in the struggling cause of human development, something more than a set of doctrinal precepts be at stake, if that stake be, to introduce into man's being by their means, the great truths of morality and justice, as his only safe and firm possessions; surely something more than the mere abstract and theoretical acceptance of these great precepts must be designed. Here then let us not fail once more to place before us that truth, which we have everywhere sought to elucidate,—'the unity of the Idea and the Life,' a unity established by Mosaism, but apparently impaired by Prophetism and wholly dissolved by Christianity. The goal of mankind's destiny cannot assuredly only be to produce the accordance of all men in a set of doctrinal precepts. No! the goal of mankind's destiny must be, to establish the unity of the Idea and the Life, and in that very unity to prepare and produce the unity of the whole race of man. And this, my respected hearers, is manifestly a work far more difficult of achievement than a union in the Idea. When the prophet predicted that mankind collectively would one day acknowledge the One only God, and that an age of universal peace, of universal justice would commence, that prophecy could be but imperfectly and partially understood. For be it admitted that differences of religion have given rise to discord, deeds of violence and war, that belief and its exclusions have furnished the pretext, and have been the cloak or the reason for enduring enmity and countless horrors, and that of these, the union of mankind in one faith could alone prevent the

recurrence; still there remain too many other elements of strife among mankind, and human passions too frequently obtain the mastery even over that known to be good, to admit a mere recognition of the principle of universal peace, being of power to ensure the exercise of universal justice and universal love. The essential reason of the powerlessness of that recognition, is to be found in the severance of the Idea and the Life. How far soever mankind may have progressed in ideal religious cognition, in life they still remain for the most part bound by the trammels of heathenism. While in theory heathen egotism is recognised to be bad and is rejected as wrong, it yet remains the basis of of human society, the life principle of the individual. Heathen egotism had built up the social edifice of inequality of justice, complete inequality of possession, and of the total separation between governors and governed, between the freeman and the slave. Under the action of those principles, the individual must have been wholly filled with, and influenced by, egotism; the individual man must have sought before all things, and with all his power, to secure to himself all possible rights, the largest possible possessions, the greatest possible power and dominion; and thus must the actual condition of inequality and servitude have been increased and embittered to an incalculable and fearful extent. Thus in truth was developed that inexplicable confusion of human relations, which transforms life in our sight into an enigma. True it is that even then, the Religious Idea in Mosaism had declared the true foundations of human society to be, equality of right, all possible equality of possession, and personal freedom for the individual, and had rendered imperative as moral

laws, the exercise of justice and compassion; but that the heathenism that had shown itself in the Jewish race. had from the very commencement counteracted the entire realisation of these principles, even in the race itself. Further, though the later Jewish polity adopted as many as possible of these principles, and at any rate adhered firmly to equality of right in all its phases; yet later the Jewish race came under the dominion of other peoples, and were fettered by it. Finally Talmudism, in consequence of its comprehension of Mosaic law according to the letter, permitted but a very limited realisation of the Mosaic principles under the new conditions called for by the altered position of the Hebrew race. Christianity meantime adopted personal freedom and equality as abstract principles only, and denied them all direct influence and action upon society.

The old Heathen rule that had, as in India and Egypt, in part established castes, and with them the respective authority of the different classes and orders among each other, in part the dominion of races, as in Greece and Rome, resolved itself at last into the undivided sway of the Roman Emperors. With the Middle Ages arose the second form of Heathen rulethe Feudal system; which divided society into noble and serf, and made the one possessor, the other the possession, the one a freeman, the other a serf. At their side stood the Church, independent of both in its organ the Priesthood. Then when corporations and municipalities developed themselves in the midst of both these classes, when replete with vigour, and aided by the force of other circumstances, they grew into a powerful third estate, the Feudal system succeeded in

introducing within all these several members of the bodypolitic, strong lines of demarcation. It also reproduced the old heathen institutions of castes, by the subdivision and arrangement of the nobles into classes of nobility; of the burghers into guilds and corporations; and by renewing the vitality of a priesthood in a hierarchical chief or head. Thus, nowhere, in such a condition of things, could the realisation of the religious idea be thought of. For heathen egotism must have everywhere generated struggles and conflicts among the several classes between each other, and also between the individuals of which each class was composed. These constant collisions reduced human society to a state well-nigh of barbarism, in which force and fraud were held in check (and often but imperfectly in check,) by the power of the state alone. The Feudal system of government at length resolved itself into the despotic rule of the sovereign, without however the Feudal subdivisions in human society being thereby superseded. Notwithstanding this, when a more developed stage of human reason rose into activity, and the general mind began to perceive the contrast presented by the idea and actual life, the principle indwelling the religious idea of the equality and universal rights of men, could not fail ever more powerfully to impress mankind and to call forth a strong reaction in material life. This reaction was further stimulated by that dire oppression of the masses generated by the feudal system. The long-prepared storm burst upon society towards the end of the last century, in the thunders of the French revolution. The objects to be attained were declared to be three-fold:-1st. The general acknowledgment of the universal rights of men; 2nd. the actual re-edifi-

cation of society on this foundation; and, 3rd. the regulation of all the consequences which heathen rule had left and still produced, in the existing relations of men. In these three several and naturally consecutive processes, difficulties of no ordinary kind were to be surmounted. For this a long future lay before the world: a future that was to be marked by a total subversion of all existing circumstances; a future which should realise that condition of universal peace and love so often painted as belonging to the world of fancy alone, to the land of dreams. For though the general acknowledgment of human rights and human equality has but very partially obtained the victory even up to the present day, yet far more limited is its sphere of actual practical realisation. Consequently, the question cannot yet be entertained of the total annihilation of the traces of heathen rule, of the entire levelling of all distinctions and divisions. We are now but at the opening of the vista; yet may we deem ourselves happy and blessed in being able to perceive from afar, the high and sublime goal towards which mankind is slowly travelling; albeit we have no precise knowledge as to the path which shall conduct them thither.* For would we enquire; how will mankind reach the term, where the Idea and the Life shall form a unity within the religious idea; where equality of right, all possible equality of possession, and personal freedom shall be realised in human society; and where, under these conditions, these principles shall have

^{*} Or rather, we have our place at the lowest point of the upward path, and catch the first rays of the orb of day gilding that mountain's top, whose ascent is the task of mankind for future ages, and on whose summit alone, the full refulgence can be beheld.—A.M.G.

entirely imbued and shall wholly govern individual man? We reply; here again the only deduction applicable, is that at which we arrived in discussing material religions. No sudden subversion, no violent revolutions, are inherent in the nature of man, are the necessary conditions of his development. Subversion and revolution destroy that which exists but do not construct a really new edifice. Subversion and revolution are the crisis of a disorder, but the convalescence is slow and progressive and may have been imperilled or postponed by the violent crisis. The right is slowly prepared and developed; slow is its victory over the wrong; slowly does it displace the wrong and obtain final dominion.

But who can close his eyes to the truth, that in the domain of the actual, the enduring tendency and effort are every where manifest, for the realisation of this union of mankind in the unity of the idea and the life, in equality of right, all possible equality of possession, and personal freedom? Who can deny that these have become a want, a necessity for the human race? This is Constitutional government is the first step taken. The basis it has assumed is already different from that of the feudal and despotic forms of government. The vast institutions for the relief of the poor, the efforts made to remove pauperism, the attempted elevation of the masses, especially the awakening and increasing vitality perceptible in municipal, parochial, and corporate bodies, are actual palpable signs. All these it is true, are but insufficient and palliative measures. Yet are they the first important steps, which in their onward progress will assuredly indicate the whole road by which the grand consummation will be reached.

Here again let us not be unmindful of the Jews, of whom the civil and religious emancipation, the recognition as citizens, are pledges for the future spread of liberty of conscience and belief. The right to existence being conceded in that recognition, to the ancient antagonism, the views entertained by society in general, have thereby undergone a considerable change. And the Jews may be congratulated on being again herein, as bearers of this acceptance of the principle of freedom of conscience, an important historical instrument in the hand of Divine Providence.

After having thus endeavoured to elucidate and determine the Future of mankind, permit me, my respected hearers, once more to bestow a glance on the Present. Judaism then is about to cast off the veil of Talmudic ceremonial law. To this course the Jews are compelled by the part they have assumed in active life, by the development of History, whose current for them had long been arrested, and by the newly aroused freedom and activity of the soul and the intellect? But what is the danger incurred by this movement? That Judaism in thus enfranchising itself, should also discard its greatest characteristic, one which has never wholly disappeared from Judaism, one without which it would be defective Judaism, an imperfect substitute for that which it is appointed to be. That characteristic is the unity, the mutually vivifying amalgamation of the Idea and the Life. If Judaism were reduced to the condition of a mere passing exposition of certain general dogmas and were denuded of all external forms, it would no longer possess that consistency, firmness and self-dependence which, until the final issue of all conflicts on behalf of the Religious Idea shall be attained, will ever be

indispensable to Judaism. This then is our task;—to work out our conception of the thoughts indwelling Mosaism, into ever increasing purity, and to give to those thoughts, by means of the unity of the Idea and the Life, their fitting active realisation, their true embodiment. Not alone the dogma, not the worship alone, but the great social thoughts of Mosaism, are to be brought as institutions, into actual operation.

Christianity on its side, is about to witness the resolution of the specifically Christian dogmas and their transmutation into the pure Religious Idea. danger incurred is, that on the one hand, all that is general will be resolved into the individual, that the individual will make itself valid as the sole claimant to dominion, and that thus there will ensue, instead of union, a disruption of the general into its elements, and a consequent chaotic confusion of those elements. The danger on the other hand is, that in the rushing away from dogma, a refuge will be sought in pantheism or modern heathenism. The task of the Christian therefore is to find, by a return to original Christianity, or rather to the sources whence Christianity flowed, the pure and undefiled Religious Idea; to free it from heathen modifications, and to attach to it the positive firm ground-work of Judaism. In both these processes are both these religions engaged, and at these final points will they meet.

Here my hearers I have done. We have recognised the great goal of mankind, to be the whole Religious Idea, and its realisation in the unity of the Idea and the Life. We have endeavoured to make clear to our comprehension, the paths of history which up to the present have led, those which out of the present into the future will lead, to this end. These are the gradual but sure development of existing religions from heathenism to the entire and pure Religious Idea; the progress of existing society, from its heathen constitution, to the unity of the Idea and the Life; that is, to the three great principles of equality of right, all possible equality of possession, and all personal freedom compatible with the two previous conditions. We have seen how from the beginning Divine Providence has conducted mankind on this course, thus slowly and simultaneously working out the union of free development and of the given Religious Idea A rich and rare grain of seed did God's Providence sow, in a remote corner of the globe. There He watered and fructified it, till it burst through its earthy covering; until it sent up a shoot, and put forth a stem that has ever since been rising higher and higher, ever spreading out new branches, rich in foliage and fruit; until at length the giant tree shall behold all mankind meeting in close brotherhood under the broad shade of its mighty growth of ages. This majestic tree is called 'The Religious Idea, realised in the universal life of man.'

My respected friends, may I have succeeded, even though imperfectly, in accomplishing the high and important task I undertook, when commencing these Lectures! I desired not to propound anything singular, anything new; I sought not—even had I had the means of so doing—to found any new sect, to proclaim any new doctrine. I have only sought to bring to bear, so far as in me lay, on the darkened and entangled maze of the present, the broad light of history, and thus to render it clear to you, that there where endless confusion and conflict seem to prevail, really exist design

and an appointed end; that something higher is extant, which exalted far above parties, is destined to prevail over them all; which will assign unto each its certain task, until all shall be united in the two most precious gifts vouchsafed to man,—Freedom and Truth.



THE END.

ERRATA.

Page 159, line 18 . . for was read were (bis).

" 200 " 2 . . . for meteors read matters.

University of California SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388 Return this material to the library from which it was borrowed.

QL OCT 0 6 1997 JUN 2 4 1998





A 000 046 662 3

Unive So

STAC